THE CULTIC SETTING OF REALIZED ESCHATOLOGY IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY

SUPPLEMENTS TO
NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

EDITORIAL BOARD

W. C. VAN UNNIK, PRESIDENT

P. BRATSIOTIS — K. W. CLARK — H. CLAVIER — J. W. DOEVE — J. DORESSE

C. W. DUGMORE — J. DUPONT — A. GEYSER — W. GROSSOUW

A. F. J. KLIJN — PH. H. MENOUD — BO REICKE — K. H. RENGSTORFF

E. STAUFFER

VOLUME XXVIII

LEIDEN

E. J. BRILL

1972

THE CULTIC SETTING OF REALIZED ESCHATOLOGY IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY

BY

DAVID EDWARD AUNE

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1972

Copyright 1972 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands
All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

TO MARY LOU

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE IX

I. INTRODUCTION 1

The Phenomenon of "Realized" Eschatology in Early Christianity 1
Statement of the Thesis 8
Major Ways of Conceptualizing Eschatological Salvation as a Realized Phenomenon in Early Christian Experience 11
Application of the Thesis to a Controlled Typological Grouping of Interrelated Texts 23

II. THE PRESENT REALIZATION OF ESCHATOLOGICAL SALVATION IN THE QUMRAN COMMUNITY 29

Introduction 29
The Thesis of Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn 31
Realized Eschatology and the Paradise Motif 37
Conclusions 42

III. THE PRESENT REALIZATION OF ESCHATOLOGICAL SALVATION IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL 45

Introduction to the Problem 45
The Communal Setting and Socio-Religious Environment out of Which the Fourth Gospel Arose 65
The Character of the Realized Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel 102
Conclusions 133

IV. THE PRESENT REALIZATION OF ESCHATOLOGICAL SALVATION IN THE LETTERS OF IGNATIUS 136

Introduction to the Problem 136
Ignatius' Conception of the Gospel 139
Modes of Appropriating the Benefits of Salvation . . . 142
The Nature and Significance of Eschatological Salvation 152
Conclusions 164

V. The Present Realization of Eschatological Salvation in the Odes of Solomon 166

Introduction 166
The Cultic Setting of the Odes 174
The Cultic Setting of Eschatological Salvation in the Odes 184
Conclusions 193

VI. The Present Realization of Eschatological Salvation in the Thought of Marcion of Sinope . . 195

Introduction 195
The Nature of Salvation According to Marcion 197
Marcion's Conception of Future Eschatological Existence 202
The Present Appropriation of Future Eschatological Existence 211
Ascetic Motivations in Early Syrian Christianity and Marcion 215
Conclusions 219

Summary 220

Indices 226

PREFACE

This study was originally accepted as a Ph.D. dissertation by the Department of New Testament and Early Christian Literature of the University of Chicago. The original scope of the project was far more ambitious than that presented between the covers of this monograph. Comprehensive treatments of Jesus and Paul were envisioned as well as a foray into the published Coptic-Gnostic materials from Nag Hammadi. The limited scope of the present study has proven to be a much more eminently manageable block of material, and I am greatly indebted to Professor Robert M. Grant for invaluable guidance and advice as research on this subject was in progress. Let not the charge that I may be ἐξ ὄνυχος τὸν λέοντα γράφων be laid at his door. I would also like to express my appreciation to Professors Allen P. Wikgren and Norman Perrin for their helpfulness in reading and advising this study in various stages of its development. Special thanks are due to Professor Otto Betz who offered many helpful suggestion on that section of the study devoted to the Qumran Community.

The publication of this monograph was in part made possible by a grant from the John XXIII Institute of Chicago, Illinois. I am especially grateful to Miss Claudette Dwyer for her interest in this project on behalf of the Institute, and to Miss Mary Lederer its Acting Director. Dr. Harry A. Marmion, president of St. Xavier College, provided valuable counsel and support during the initial stages of this publishing venture. A final word of appreciation is due to the one who first introduced me to the historical-critical method of New Testament research, Professor A. Berkeley Mickelsen, my former teacher and fellow layman in the Baptist General Conference.

St. Xavier College
Chicago, Illinois

DAVID E. AUNE

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Phenomenon of "Realized" Eschatology in Early Christianity

Prior to the twenthieth century, students of the New Testament and of early Christian literature had little reason to qualify the useful term "eschatology" [1] with such apparently unnecessary or even antithetical adjectives as "consistent" (Schweitzer),[2] "realized" (Dodd), "sich realisierende" (Haenchen, Jeremias), "proleptic" (Fuller), "inaugurated" (Florovsky, J. A. T. Robinson), or "fulfilled" (Hoskyns). Whether the term was applied to the individual, the nation or the world, the reference was largely (if not exclusively) confined to the relative future. Today, after more than six decades of research into the significance of eschatology for Christian origins, the term has acquired an "umbrella" sense,[3] so that its usefulness has become directly proportional to the extent to which it is carefully defined and qualified.[4] The popularization of the term by Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer with reference to the end of time, history and the cosmos [5] has resulted in a general restriction of the term to national and cosmic expectation alone in the jargon of Biblical research.[6] A great

[1] "Eschatology," literally meaning "the doctrine of last things," was first coined in the nineteenth century as an alternate title for the section of dogmatic theology customarily titled *De novissimus* in which the doctrines of physical death, the intermediate state, the second coming of Christ, the resurrection, the last judgment and the final states of the righteous and wicked were treated.

[2] Schweitzer's expression "konsequente Eschatologie" was intended to counter the current liberal practise of eliminating the eschatological husk from the ethical kernel of Jesus' message.

[3] The term was coined by W. A. Whitehouse, "The Modern Discussion of Eschatology," *Eschatology* (Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, No. 2; Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, n. d.), p. 72.

[4] The not uncommon use of the patently tautological phrase "futuristic eschatology" is symptomatic of this crisis in definition.

[5] The term "apocalyptic" is currently reserved for the kind of eschatology described and discussed by both Schweitzer and Weiss.

[6] The rejection of "individual" eschatology as a contradiction in terms has become common practise; cf. the opening paragraph of Paul Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdische Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Tübingen:

deal of unnecessary confusion has resulted from the de-temporalization of the term by dialectical theologians, a confusion which has affected New Testament research profoundly through the massive influence of Rudolf Bultmann.[1]

One of the most significant aspects of the progress of Biblical research during the first six decades of the twentieth century has been the gradual recognition of the significance which eschatology had in the origin of the Christian faith and in its subsequent early theological and historical development.[2] The fact that Biblical scholars have gradually learned to take eschatology seriously has also had its predictable effect on systematic theology. By the middle of the century two different yet related schools of theological thought have attempted to make eschatology an integral theological datum: the "theology of hope" of Jürgen Moltmann,[3] and the positive assessment of the theological significance of apocalyptic eschatology by the Pannenberg school.[4]

Since research into the nature of Jewish and Christian eschatology at the beginning of the twentieth century was largely carried out by the Göttingen-centered *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, the search for parallels in comparative religions which might illuminate the eschatology of Jesus and the early church served to obscure the

---

J. C. B. Mohr, 1934), p. 1: "Unter Eschatologie ist im folgenden verstanden die Lehre von den letzten Dingen, sofern sie als einheitliche Akte oder Zustände die Gemeinschaft betreffen, Volk oder Welt. Eschatologie des Individuums ist ein Widerspruch in sich."

[1] See the penetrating discussion by Gösta Lundström, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*, trans. Joan Bulman (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1963), pp. 140-55.

[2] Since this development was primarily the result of the intensive investigation of the synoptic tradition, an excellent survey is available in Norman Perrin's book *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963).

[3] Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope: On the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology*, trans. James W. Leitch (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967). An American mutation of this emphasis may be found in Carl E. Braaten, *The Future of God: The Revolutionary Dynamics of Hope* (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969).

[4] Wolfhart Pannenberg, ed., *Revelation as History*, trans. David Granskou (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968), and *idem, Jesus—God and Man*, trans. Lewis L. Wilkins and Duane A. Priebe (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968). For an excellent critique of the use of apocalyptic by the Pannenberg school see Hans Dieter Betz, "The Concept of Apocalyptic in the Theology of the Pannenberg Group," *Journal for Theology and the Church*, VI (1969), 192-207.

unique emphases of Jesus' message. It was through the utilization of the methodology of this school (although accompanied by a rejection of its dogmatic stance) that Albert Schweitzer was able to arrive at his emphasis on *konsequente Eschatologie.* This position of Schweitzer (repugnant to current scholarship primarily on theological grounds, and only secondarily on exegetical grounds), found an antithesis in the emphasis on "realized" eschatology by C. H. Dodd and his followers.[1] Concerned with the theological truth and relevance of Jesus and his message, Dodd based his position on the careful exegesis of the parables of Jesus contained in the synoptic tradition. It was therefore through the empirical investigation of the texts relating to the eschatological message of Jesus that the formation of the apparently contradictory expression "realized eschatology" was thought necessary.[2]

Subsequent investigation of the synoptic tradition has produced the general conviction among New Testament exegetes that the truth of the matter lies somewhere between the antithetical hypotheses of Schweitzer and Dodd. In W. G. Kümmel's book, *Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus,*[3] the author presents and attempts to substantiate three interrelated theses

---

[1] In C. H. Dodd's book, *The Parables of the Kingdom,* (rev. ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961), he systematically applies his theory of realized eschatology to the parables of Jesus. He cites with approval the expression coined by Rudolf Otto, "der Schonanbruch des Reiches Gottes" (p. 34, n. 1). It was perhaps the implicit elimination of any residual element of futurity in the term which occasioned Dodd's later expression of dissatisfaction with it. In *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), p. 447, n. 1, he refers to "realized eschatology" as a "not altogether felicitous term," but refers to retain it as a "label". As acceptable alternative expressions he mentions the term "inaugurated eschatology" suggested by the Russian Orthodox theologian Georges Florovsky, and the phrase "sich realisierende Eschatologie" suggested by Joachim Jeremias. The latter term, which may be translated paraphrastically "eschatology that is in the process of realization," was suggested to Jeremias by Ernst Haenchen; cf. Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus,* trans. S. H. Hooke (rev. ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), p. 230, n. 3.

[2] Cf. Dodd, *Parables,* p. 34: "This declaration that the Kingdom of God has already come necessarily dislocates the whole eschatological scheme in which its expected coming closes the long vista of the future. The *eschaton* has moved from the future to the present, from the sphere of expectation into that of realized experience."

[3] W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus,* trans. Dorothea M. Barton (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 23; London: S. C. M. Press, 1961).

which (with certain modifications) have become virtually the *communis opinio* of current New Testament scholarship: (1) There is incontrovertible evidence that in the eschatological teaching of Jesus, the kingdom of God is a future reality which will appear imminently.[1] (2) Similarly, there is incontrovertible evidence in the teaching of Jesus that the kingdom of God is a present reality through the words and deeds of Jesus. (3) Finally, the eschatological message of Jesus is to be contrasted with the apocalyptic eschatology characteristic of late Judaism.[2]

Symptomatic of the current general agreement that Jesus held a paradoxical juxtaposition of the kingdom of God as both a present reality and a future expectation was the publication within a single year of three books written by scholars of widely divergent denominational, national and educational backgrounds. Each of the three accepted as axiomatic the presence of the present-future dialectic in the eschatological message of Jesus: Norman Perrin, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), Gösta Lundström, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*, trans. Joan Bulman (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1963), and George Eldon Ladd, Jesus and the Kingdom: *The Eschatology of Biblical Realism* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964).

While it is therefore true that the tension between present and future in the teaching of Jesus may no longer be denied, the real problem lies in understanding the precise nature of this tension.[3] Unfortunately, it is precisely at this point that the great areas of disagreement begin to open up between the various attempts to account for these two crucial foci in the eschatological message of Jesus.[4] Fortunately, it is not our purpose to attempt the con-

[1] The element of imminence—one of the few vestiges of apocalyptic eschatology which Kümmel insists belonged to the eschatological message of Jesus—has been disputed by a number of scholars. Kümmel has attempted to defend his position in an article entitled "Die Naherwartung in der Verkündigung Jesu," *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte* (Marburg: N. G. Elwert Verlag, 1964), pp. 457-70.

[2] This emphasis on the uniqueness of the message of Jesus reveals the extent to which Kümmel and his contemporaries believe they have transcended the inherent limitations of a strict application of the *religionsgeschichtliche Methode*.

[3] Perrin, *The Kingdom of God*, p. 185.

[4] Cf. Robert Funk, "Apocalyptic as an Historical and Theological Problem in Current New Testament Scholarship," *Journal for Theology and the Church*, VI (1969), 180: "But beyond the acknowledgment of an elusive tension

struction of a unified field theory which might attempt to bring the various textual data into harmony with the results of modern New Testament scholarship. Rather, we simply wish to point out that the careful investigation of the synoptic tradition was the primary factor necessitating the redefinition of eschatology expressed through such qualifying adjectives as "realized." Moreover, since most of the research on early Christian eschatology has been focused on the significance of eschatology in the message of Jesus, it must be realized that most of the terminology and models for the study of early Christian eschatology have arisen within this context.

Once we have shifted the focus of our attention from the eschatology of Jesus to that of the early church, we must inquire whether there are any new developments in the historical situation which might radically alter our approach to the subject matter.

Perhaps the single most important historical development within the early church was the rise of the cultic worship of the exalted Jesus within the primitive Palestinian church.[1] The ideational

---

between the two senses [i.e., the kingdom of God as in some sense present, in some sense future], the consensus rapidly dissolves. The dissolution is especially apparent when the question of imminence is introduced.'"

[1] This theory, together with its significance for Christian origins, was first formulated and emphasized by Adolf Deissmann, and was thereafter widely adopted by the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*; cf. Adolf Deissmann, *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*, trans. William E. Wilson (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1957), pp. 113-132. The influence of Deissmann on Wilhelm Bousset may be seen in a short laudatory note in the latter's classic work *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus* (5. Aufl.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), p. 90, n. 1: "It is, so far as I can see, the lasting service of Deissmann, to have pointed out with great energy the fact that the Christology of early Christianity and of the ancient church must be understood from the perspective of the Christ-cult." Ernst Troeltsch, the systematic theologian of the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, paid a similar tribute to Deissmann in *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, trans. Olive Wyon (Harper Torchbooks; New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1960), I, 69, n. 33: "To my friend *Deissmann* I owe the opinion that the central happening in Primitive Christianity was the rise of a Christ-cult out of faith in Christ, and that only then there arose a new religious community because there was already a new cult." Deissmann's ubiquitous influence is also to be seen in the classic work of one of the founders of the *formgeschichtliche Schule*, Karl Ludwig Schmidt, a book dedicated to Adolf Deissmann: *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964), p. vi: "If the rise of Christianity is the development of a cult—this recognition has prevailed more and more during recent years—then it is clear that the rise of early

correlative of the rise and development of the "Christ-cult" is a presupposition which underlies all early Christian literature: the conviction that the eschaton has been enacted, but in such a way as to permit the continuation of time and history.[1] These two factors of cult and eschatology are inextricably interrelated, as the following study will seek to demonstrate.

At this point it is appropriate to inquire whether the term "realized" eschatology should be retained, and if so, with what significance. First of all, if the expression is taken to mean a complete realization of the eschatological blessings of salvation with no residue of futurity whatever, then it is hopelessly inappropriate. Secondly, to use the term in this rigid sense is historically impossible, since all Christian eschatologies (including those of the Gnostics) contain a dual emphasis on the present and future realization of the eschaton (although in widely varying proportions). Frequently Jewish apocalyptic is made the model of an eschatological expectation which is completely future-oriented, while Gnosticism is regarded as antithetical, with a supposed emphasis on the total realization of eschatological salvation within (or in spite of) this present life.[2] Both of these characterizations are caricatures, as

---

Christian literature must be understood on the basis of the cult. As far as I am concerned, the significance of the early Christian cult and the exercise of divine worship for the development of gospel literature cannot be too highly regarded. The oldest traditions about Jesus are cult-oriented . . ."

[1] Whitehouse, "The Modern Discussion of Eschatology," p. 68.

[2] For the Valentinians, for example, the final goal of eschatological salvation was the cessation of the material universe, and the ascension of the perfect ones together with Achamoth back into the Pleroma (Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 1. 1. 12; since the references to this work of Irenaeus are made according to the numbering system of W. Wigan Harvey, ed., *Irenaeus. Libros quinque adversus haereses textu graeco in locis nonnullis locupletato, versione latina cum codicibus claromontano ac arundeliano denuo collata, praemissa de placitis gnosticorum prolusione, fragmenta necnon graece, syriace, armeniace, commentatione perpetua et indicibus variis,* 2 vols. [Cambridge: Typis Academicis, 1857], and not Masson, such references will hereinafter be followed by the volume and page number of Harvey's edition: Harvey, I, 58-9). This is a future event which will occur when Achamoth has completed the full harvest of her "seed" (Tertullian *Adv. Val.* 31), and they are therefore able to speak in terms of an "eschaton": "Dominum in novissimis mundi temporibus propter hoc venisse ad passionem dicunt, ut ostendat, quae circa novissimum Aeonum facta est, passionem, et per hunc finem manifestet finem ejus, quae est circa Aeonas, dispositionis" (Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 1. 1. 16; Harvey, I, 68). Nevertheless upon the communication of salvific knowledge, the Valentinians regarded themselves as having already ascended into the heavenly Pleroma: "Si enim se, hoc est ipsorum hominem, statim supergredi dicunt Demiurgum, et abire ad Matrem . . ."

we hope to demonstrate at least provisionally in our discussion of the eschatology of the Qumran community and of Marcion of Sinope. Because of the wide currency of the term "realized" eschatology, we prefer to retain the expression which shall be defined as those aspects of eschatological salvation which are somehow conceived of as partially realized in Christian experience within the frame work of present time, history and worldly conditions. The correlative of realized eschatology so defined would then be "final" or "futuristic" eschatology.

The present study proceeds from the assumption that realized eschatology within early Christianity is not a phenomenon unique to the history of religions. Judaeo-Christian eschatologies are unique only to the extent that they mitigate the anti-historical attitude typical of most of the world's religions by their conception of the theophanic valorization of the historical process. Nevertheless, while Iranian and Judaeo-Christian eschatologies are primarily concerned with personal and/or corporate salvation conceptualized in a great variety of ways, the underlying presupposition of these eschatologies remains anti-historical in that time, history and the cosmos as presently constituted are not regarded as being completely appropriate for realizing the ideal destiny of man or for supplying a satisfactory meaning for his existence. Eschatology, therefore, is primarily an idealization of soteriology, and is concerned with man's final attainment of individual and/or social blessedness. Within both Judaism and early Christianity, this final state of blessedness is most frequently conceived as the attainment of the primal state from which man originally fell. On the basis of this Judaeo-Christian conceptualization of the eschaton as the time for the *restitutio principii*, one might speak more accurately of "protology" than of eschatology.[1] Actually, eschatology and protology

(Irenaeus *Adv. haer* 2. 47. 1; Harvey, I, 366), "Plurimi autem et contemtores facti, quasi jam perfecti, sine reverentia, et in contemtu viventes, semetipsos spiritales vocant, et se nosse jam dicunt eum qui sit intra Pleroma ipsorum refrigerii locum" (Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 3. 15. 2; Harvey, II, 80-91). By means of the sacrament of mystical marriage, they anticipated the celestial marriages which the perfect were expected to consumate when they meet their male angelic counterparts in the Pleroma (Tertullian *Adv. Val.* 30; cf. Clement of Alexandria *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 21. 1-2). It cannot therefore be contested that the present-future dialectic also obtains in this variety of Gnosticism.

[1] G. van der Leeuw, the reknowned phenomenologist of religion, gives a broad definition of eschatology in an informative article entitled "Urzeit und Endzeit," *Der Mensch und die mythische Welt*, Eranos-Jahrbuch, Bd.

function homologously, with the functionally insignificant difference that in eschatology the ideal conditions of the primal period are located not only at the beginning of time but also at its end.[1] Since "realized protology" is a relatively common phenomenon in comparative religions, and since the mode of realization is primarily cultic ritual, we are predisposed in our investigation of the phenomenon of realized eschatology within early Christianity to assess its meaning and significance within the context of the Christian cultus.[2]

Statement of the Thesis

The thesis which forms the basic point of departure for the present study may be stated succintly in the following terms: the variety of ways in which eschatological salvation [3] was conceptualized in early Christianity as a phenomenon realized in present corporate and individual experience arose out of and was determined by the current forms of Christian cult and piety. That is to say that realized eschatology in all the variety of its expression

17 (Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1950), p. 31: "Unter Eschatologie verstehen wir das Wort des Menschen, soweit es auf das Randgeschehen sich bezieht, auf die Welt bevor sie Welt ist und nachdem sie aufgehört hat, Welt zu sein. Die Herrlichkeit des ersten Tages gehört dazu, aber auch der Schrecken des Jüngsten Tages, *novissima rerum*."

[1] Mircea Eliade, *Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Harper Torchbooks; New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1959), p. 106: "Thus, *in illo tempore* is situated not only at the beginning of time but also at its end."

[2] On the subject of what we have termed "realized protology," see Eliade, *Cosmos and History*, pp. 49-92 (Chapter 2: "The Regeneration of Time"); *idem*, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, trans. Rosemary Sheed (Meridian Books; Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1963), pp. 388-97. See also S. G. F. Brandon, *History, Time and Deity: A History and Comparative Study of the Conception of Time in Religious Thought and Practise* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1965), especially Chapter 6: "The Ritual Perpetuation of the Past."

[3] In early Christianity, all salvation must be understood as eschatological salvation, since the contrast between man's original (or intended) nature and his present nature is such that his true destiny can only be realized socially after the conclusion of time and history, or individually after personal death. Future realization is always a significant component of Christian soteriology, regardless of the extent to which the benefits of salvation are appropriated and experienced within the framework of present worldly conditions. In the following study, the noun "salvation" will frequently be qualified by the adjective "eschatological" in order to emphasize the fact that salvation properly belongs to the ultimate destiny and final state of human existence.

is not primarily a datum in an intellectualized schema of early Christian theologians or religious thinkers. Rather, it is a matter of vital faith and religious experience which is channeled and stereotyped in its external expression by the modalities of cult and piety current at that time. It is not our purpose to support the dubious contention that the cultic expression of religious experience always precedes the theoretical and dogmatic elements which may be the eventual precipitate of that experience.[1] Rather, with Joachim Wach, we are convinced that the theoretical and practical expressions of religious experience are inextricably intertwined, and that primacy cannot be imputed to one or the other.[2] The immediate consequence of this assumption is that neither element can be understood fully apart from the other. It is on this basis that the present study will seek to demonstrate that the variety of ways in which realized eschatology is conceptualized within the texts which form the object of our investigation cannot be understood properly unless their origin in the context of the cult and piety of early Christianity is both recognized and evaluated.

At this point in our study, a careful definition of the terms "cult" or "cultus" and "piety" is both important and necessary. "Cult" may be defined as "the visible, socially arranged and ordered, efficacious forms through which the religious experience of communion between the deity and the 'community' is actualized and its effects expressed." [3] This definition is flanked by a wider as well as a narrower definition of cult, both of which we regard as inadequate. The definition of cult in the wider sense includes "all actions which flow from and are determined by religious

[1] The primacy of the Israelite cult was strongly emphasized by William Robertson Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*, ed. Stanly A. Cook (London: A. & C. Black, 1927), pp. 20ff., 25.

[2] Joachim Wach, *Sociology of Religion* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1944), p. 25.

[3] S. Mowinckel, "Kultus," *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3d ed., vol. IV, cols. 120-21. See also Sigmund Mowinckel, *Religion und Kultus*, trans. Albrecht Schauer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953), pp. 10-13. In his book on Paul, Deissmann devotes some space to the discussion of the "cult-historical method," and to the careful definition of what he means by "cult" and "cultus." He distinguishes the former from the latter by defining the latter as "the solemnities practised in worship by an organised religious body and of the formal expression of these solemnities" (*Paul*, p. 115). "Cult" is defined as that which "lies behind the cultus as its spiritual precondition: a practical dependence upon the deity, an attitude adopted toward the deity, a readiness for religious conduct, a readiness for religious dealing, religious dealing itself" (*Ibid.*, p. 115).

experience." [1] We reject this definition as inadequate because we prefer to employ the useful term "piety" to designate the extra-cultic expressions of religious experience and obligation. A much narrower definition of cult is preferred by Rudolf Bultmann:

> But to what extent are these meetings and the services held in them to be termed cultic in the strict sense? That depends upon the definition of cult. We venture a definition in three parts: 1. *Cult* means human action—especially sacrifice, but also other acts—which influences the deity, disposes Him graciously toward the congregation, and makes His power effective for it. 2. This action takes place at fixed, holy times, in a holy place, and according to holy rules or rites. 3. This action is performed by persons of special quality, priests, who mediate between the deity and the congregation. [2]

Through the adoption of a mediating and flexible definition of cult, emphasizing the external and objective forms of corporate worship, it is our purpose to delineate as precisely as possible the ways in which realized eschatology is conceptualized within the religious experience a formally structured communal context.

While "piety" or "spirituality" may be looked upon exclusively as the subjective side of religion,[3] we would prefer to expand

[1] Wach, *Sociology of Religion*, p. 25. This definition of cult is essentially the same as that offered by Deissmann (*supra*, p. 12, n. 3). A similar definition of cult is given by Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Social and Religious Institutions* (New York and Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961), p. 271: "By 'cult' we mean all those acts by which communities or individuals give outward expression to their religious life, by which they seek and achieve contact with God."

[2] Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951-55), I, 121. In reply to the criticisms of von Dobschütz, who regarded temple, priest and sacrifice as the outward signs of cultus and who designated the purpose of the cultus as the exertion of influence upon God (Deissmann, *Paul*, pp. 114-15, n. 2), Deissmann further distinguished between "acting" cults (those which try to influence the deity), and "reacting" cults (those in which the action of man is an action in response to the deity). He regarded the Christian cult as a reacting cult (*Ibid.*, pp. 117-18). Hans Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament*, trans. John Bowden (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969), pp. 257f. is willing to define cult much as Deissmann's "reacting" cult, but only because of his emphasis on justification by faith. He states that "if holiness is defined as a strange holiness in Christ, which is experienced through the word, then there is a cult only in the sense of hearing." Both Bultmann and Conzelmann hesitate to describe earliest Christianity as a cult, possible because of an all but unconscious heritage from German Idealism which devalued religious externality.

[3] W. Trillhaas, "Frömmigkeit," *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3d ed., vol. II, col. 1158; E. M. Kredel, "Frömmigkeit," *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, vol. IV, col. 398.

this common definition to include primarily those external expressions of religious experience and obligation on the part of individuals or clusters of individuals outside the context of corporate worship.[1] While participation in the forms of cultic worship must certainly be regarded as one expression of Christian piety,[2] the extra-cultic expressions of piety are of such importance for our investigation of the phenomenon of realized eschatology as to merit extensive treatment in and of themselves. Although the Christian church as an eschatological community is empirically constituted and defined in cultic assembly [3] (no early Christian writer states this more clearly and insistently than Ignatius of Antioch), the possibility of realizing the blessings of eschatological salvation is not negated by the absence of empirical assembly. In the course of the following study, it will be seen that the famous dictum of Cyprian, "extra ecclesiam nulla salus est," [4] may be regarded as a major underlying presupposition of each of the texts which will form the object of our investigation (including the Dead Sea Scrolls).

Major Ways of Conceptualizing Eschatological Salvation as a Realized Phenomenon in Early Christian Experience[5]

In the group of interrelated texts which form the object of our investigation—the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Fourth Gospel, the Letters of Ignatius, the Odes of Solomon and the surviving fragments of

[1] In Louis Bouyer's excellent study *The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers*, trans. Mary P. Ryan (New York, Tournai, Paris and Rome: Desclee and Company, 1963), p. viii, he formulates a definition of spirituality: "Christian spirituality (or any other spirituality) is distinguished from dogma by the fact that, instead of studying or describing the objects of belief as it were in the abstract, it studies the reactions which these objects arouse in the religious consciousness." Bouyer's study is hindered by the traditional Roman Catholic practise of isolating moral theology from spirituality, asceticism and mysticism.

[2] Cf. Hans Lietzmann, *A History of the Early Church*, Vol. II: *The Founding of the Church Universal*, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf (Meridian Books; Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1961), II, 124: "The heart of the Christian life is to be found in the act of public worship. This is the occasion when the powers of the world beyond flow into Christian people, and transform them into the new children of God; they are no longer of this world, but even here live in a supernatural fellowship with the heavenly citizens of the kingdom of God."

[3] Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, pp. 98, 256, n. 14.

[4] Cyprian *Epistles* 73. 21.

[5] This entire introductory section also serves as a conclusion in the sense

Marcion of Sinope—eschatological salvation is conceptualized in a great variety of ways as a phenomenon capable of partial realization in present experience. The unity which underlies most of these modes of conceptualization is their common derivation either from what we may designate as the Paradise motif or tradition, or from the historically-conditioned idea of the regathering of the people of God at the end of history. Christianity inherited both of these ideas from Judaism. In addition, each one of the ways in which final eschatology is realized in the present has its primary setting in the cult and piety of the particular Christian community or group of communities in which the surviving literary evidence took final form.

There are three major modes of realizing eschatological salvation in present experience which are primarily cult-oriented: (1) Worship in the Spirit, with all of its ecstatic, charismatic and prophetic manifestations and characteristics, (2) The *sacraments* as vehicles for appropriating the benefits of eschatological salvation, and (3) Church organization and unity as the communal framework necessary for the present realization of eschatological existence. Those modes of conceptualizing realized eschatology in Christian piety are similarly three in number: (1) Christian ethics conceived as the necessary result of the present manifestation of the possession of eschatological salvation, (2) Ascetic practises which are primarily motivated by the desire to realize final eschatological existence within the framework of present worldly conditions, and (3) The proclamation of the gospel with its attendant effects of communicating either eschatological life or proleptic eschatological judgment. While most of the examples of each of these contexts in which realized eschatology is variously conceptualized will be drawn from the body of texts which forms the specific object of our investigation, from time to time we shall adduce other examples drawn from other phases of early Christian literature.

Worship in the Spirit as a Proleptic Experience of Eschatological Existence

Within the history of early Christianity, whenever the final goal of history is regarded as somehow being capable of provisional realization within time and history, that realization always occurs

---

that the major results of the ensuing study are presented in cursory fashion in order to serve as a sort of Ariadne's thread to lead the reader through the labyrinthine discussions which follow.

within a communal or cultic setting, or else extends into the life of the individual believer through his organic relationship to a particular Christian community. It is therefore completely appropriate to designate the church as an "eschatological community." Primarily this is because the basic way in which eschatology may be regarded as realized is in connection with the present possession of the Spirit of God, and the locus of the possession of the Spirit is always the community, never exclusively the individual. Individuals may be said to participate in eschatological salvation only to the extent that they participate in the cultic community through which the powers of the age to come or the world above have penetrated into the present age or world. Since the community is the primary sphere in which the powers and benefits of the age to come are operative, the present experience of eschatological salvation is by definition a phenomenon which cannot be understood apart from the cult, for it is the cult which defines the community. While the assembled community is the locus for the realization of eschatological salvation, the scattered community exhibits individual participation in eschatological salvation through the various kinds of obligation and response which we have collectively designated "piety." Nowhere in early Christianity is eschatological salvation irreversibly realized on the individual level except in the variety of religious sects which are customarily designated "Gnostic." [1]

One of the most valuable mines of information regarding the ways in which worship was carried out in segments of the early church are the letters of Paul. At the conclusion of the liturgical hymn quoted by Paul in Philippians 2:5-11,[2] Paul states that the eschatological goal which God has ordained for the cosmos is the universal confession, "Jesus Christ is Lord." In another letter, Paul observes that "no one can say 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Spirit" (I Cor. 12:3). When these two passages are correlated, it becomes evident that the final eschatological victory of God has been conceptualized in terms of the current modes of worship and confession characteristic of the Pauline churches. The confession

[1] The thesis of C. F. D. Moule, "The Individualism of the Fourth Gospel," *Novum Testamentum*, V (1962), 171-90, to the effect that eschatology is only presently realized in the experience of the individual believer, must be rejected.

[2] The phrase πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ (Phil. 2:10), constitutes very strong evidence in support of the hypothesis that this hymn has drawn its imagery from a worship setutig (Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, p. 89).

"Jesus is Lord" is evidently made through the inspiration of the Spirit within the context of the Christian community assembled for worship in anticipation of the final universal confession which will be made by the totality of created beings at the conclusion of history.[1] It is therefore quite valid to say that this particular eschatological goal is realized "in the Spirit" within the context of worship in these Pauline communities.[2] Within the context of worship the final goal of history is proleptically present to the worshippers; past and future merge into present cultic experience.[3] This way of realizing the future in the present carries with it other conceptual possibilities as well. In the Apocalypse of John, for example, the final judgment is realized in present experience within the context of worship.[4]

Imagery drawn from the Paradise motif is used in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Odes of Solomon to conceptualize the eschatological presence of the worshipping community in the heavenly realms, since the goal of soteriology expressed in these documents is the restoration of primal conditions. Within the Dead Sea Scrolls this cultic experience is conceptualized as a proleptic eschatological transport to the heavens (the original site of Paradise in Jewish tradition was thought to be the third heaven), the singing of divine praise in the company of angelic beings, and the deliverance from the power of the realm of death (which only began with the Fall.) In

[1] Oscar Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, trans. J. K. S. Reid (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), p. 22; Vernon H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol. V; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963), p. 63. So far as I am concerned, this liturgical interpretation of the confession "Jesus is Lord" does not exclude a possible background of persecution and controversy experienced in the early church. See the excellent discussion in R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii. 5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), pp. 287-319, esp. p. 291.

[2] The restriction of this confession to the rite of baptism is certainly not correct.

[3] Mowinckel, *Religion und Kultus*, p. 79: "Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft verschmelzen im 'Heute' des Festerlebnisses in eins." Cf. Eduard Schweizer, *Der Gottesdienst im Neuen Testament* (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1958), p. 7.

[4] Leonard Leroy Thompson, "The Form and Function of Hymns in the New Testament: A Study in Cultic History" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1968), p. 62. The major results of this investigation have been summarized by the author in an article entitled, "Cult and Eschatology in the Apocalypse of John," *Journal of Religion*, XLIX (1969), 330-50.

the Odes of Solomon, the Odist frequently expresses the conviction that he and his congregation have been carried by the Spirit to Paradise. The salvific effects of this corporate "Himmelfahrt" are those which Jewish eschatology characteristically attributed to the final restoration of primal conditions: possession of eternal life, freedom from disease and pain, investiture with a brilliant celestial garment of immortality or light, possession of a crown or garland, admission to the presence of the Lord with the throng of the redeemed, and the joyful participation with the heavenly angelic beings in the praise and worship of God. From this enumeration of salvific blessings in the eschaton but experienced in a preliminary way within a cultic assembly "in the Spirit," it becomes clear that the way or ways in which final eschatological salvation is conceptualized becomes decisive for determining the way or ways in which its present reality is experienced.

Another more specifically Christian way of conceptualizing the eschaton as a realized phenomenon is our interpretation of the "coming" of Jesus mentioned in the Farewell Discourses of the Fourth Gospel as a recurring experience within a cultic context described in terms of traditional early Christian Parousia imagery. Some of the references to the "seeing" and "coming" of Jesus within these Discourses apparently refer to the cultic vision or epiphany of the exalted Jesus, in which the actual pneumatic experience of a cultic Christophany is clothed in the language and imagery of conventional theophanic and Parousia traditions. While Judaism traditionally conceived of the final bestowal of eternal life and judgment as eschatological acts of God, these functions were transferred in Christian eschatologies to Jesus, depicted as the exalted and coming Son of man. Since this final coming of the exalted Jesus was conceived as either a direct visionary experience within the context of worship, or alternately as a presence mediated through prophetic personalities who spoke in the name and with the full authority of their exalted Lord,[1] the bestowal of eschatological life and the pronouncement of eschatological judgment could be experienced as a present reality by the Johannine community.

[1] Ernst Käsemann's isolation and analysis of "sentences of holy law" uttered by prophetic personalities within the context of eucharistic worship coheres well with our reconstruction of the cultic experience of the bestowal of eternal life and judgment within the Johannine community (cf. *infra*, pp. 123f.).

The intimate connection between realized eschatology and its cultic setting should not be viewed as the end result of a gradual decline in early Christian thought of the eschatological hope on the one hand, and the corruptive or mythogenic influence of Hellenism, Gnosticism or the Greek mystery religions on the other.[1] Quite the contrary. Since the core of Christian existence and experience centered in corporate worship, and the principle phenomenon of this worship was the experience of the merging of the past events of salvation history [2] with the future eschatological fulfilment in the present cultic moment, eschatology and cult must be regarded as inextricably interrelated from the very beginning.[3]

The "Sacraments" as Vehicles for Appropriating the Benefits of Eschatological Salvation

In early Christianity, the rite of Baptism was universally regarded as the indispensable means of incorporating the individual believer into the Christian community. Since the locus of the present experience of eschatological salvation was the Spirit-endowed community, Baptism rendered individual participation in the salvific benefits of the age to come a present possibility. Baptism was therefore the ritual means of re-presenting the salvific events of the past, and anticipating the future consummation of salvation in the present experience of the believer.[4] The celebration of the Lord's Supper formed the central act of the worshipping commun-

---

[1] *Contra* Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, pp. 88f., 103f. This hypothesis has been systematically applied to the history of early Christian theology by Martin Werner, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas* (Bern-Leipzig: Verlag Paul Haupt, 1941).

[2] The word "Heilsgeschichte" has been greatly overused and consequently abused in recent decades. In our opinion the term should be used only with respect to the distinctively Judaeo-Christian emphasis on the theophanic nature of history.

[3] There is no conflict between the belief in the imminent expectation of the end in early Christianity and participation in and development of cultic worship; both are necessary correlatives. On this point see Gerhard Delling, *Worship in the New Testament*, trans. Percy Scott (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962).

[4] Cf. Brandon, *Time, History and Deity*, pp. 13-30; G. W. H. Lampe, "Early Patristic Eschatology," *Eschatology* (Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, No. 2; Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, n. d.), p. 22: "This rite [Baptism] brings the saving events of the past and the future events in which salvation is to be consummated alike into the present experience of the believer."

ity,[1] and was regarded not only as the affirmation of the reality of the historical events upon which the church was founded, but also as the anticipation of the eschatological completion of the history of salvation.[2] The intimate connection between eschatology and the Eucharist is underscored by the early Christian use of the Aramaic formula *marana tha* (Didache 10:6; I Cor. 16:22; Rev. 22:20) in a Eucharistic setting. The Eucharistic liturgy contained in the Didache reveals that the cultic assembly for observance of the Lord's Supper was regarded as an anticipation of the final assembly of the church: "As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains, but was brought together and became one, so let thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom" (Didache 9:4; cf. 10:5).Therefore the unity of those who participate in the Eucharist anticipates the final eschatological unity which will be fully and permanently realized at the Parousia.[3]

We have put the term *sacraments* in italics for the simple reason that there is no equivalent category to be found in the documents which form the object of our investigation. It is a blatant anachronism to retroject a magical view of the sacraments which regards them as having independent significance into the first two centuries of Christian history. The sacraments had no such significance until after the controversy between Augustine and Ambrose, a significance which was elevated to the authority of dogma at the Council of Trent. Baptism and the Eucharist are only part of the economy of salvation in which the early Christian communities lived and participated, and they did not provide individual believers with the inalienable and irrevocable possession of the benefits of eschatological salvation.[4] This point has been made carefully in a brilliant article by A. D. Nock:

[1] This is the position of Oscar Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, trans. A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 10; London: S. C. M. Press, 1953), pp. 14-20. The early centrality of the Eucharist is disputed by Schweizer, *Der Gottesdienst*, pp. 13-14.

[2] Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. Norman Perrin (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), pp. 253ff. Referring to the Eucharist, C. H. Dodd says, "In its origin and in its governing ideas it may be described as a sacrament of realized eschatology" (*Parables*, p. 164).

[3] Bultmann, *New Testament Theology*, I, 147; Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, p. 288; cf. Martin Werner, *The Formation of Christian Dogma*, trans. S. G. F. Brandon (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957), p. 40.

[4] In a stimulating chapter entitled "Die soteriologische Bedeutung der Taufe," Werner Bieder concludes: Was aber aus allen vier Briefstellen

> Then [i.e., the fifth century], as in the first century, baptism and the Eucharist were part of the whole economy or dispensation of salvation; then, as in the first century, baptism had a public solemnity which it has largely lost: and in neither period was there any antithesis between the word of God and a sacrament or institution or ritual, or again between individual and institutional gifts of grace. [1]

Baptism was regarded as effecting an ontological transformation of the initiant only among groups of early Christians later regarded as heretical.[2] Since the resultant transformation was generally conceptualized as the present attainment of resurrection existence, Baptism became a primary means for experiencing an irrevocable realization of eschatological salvation within the present framework of wordly conditions. This mode of conceptualizing realized eschatology was characteristic of Marcion of Sinope (whose eschatology we shall discuss at length), as well as other representatives of Gnosticism.[3]

Church Organization and Unity as the Earthly Setting for the Realization of Eschatological Salvation

We have already made the general observation that in early Christianity eschatological salvation was thought to be realized

leicht deutlich geworden ist, das ist die Erkentnis, dass die Taufe nicht automatisch rettet, sondern nur insofern, als die sich retten lassenden Menschen auf dem neuen Weg praktische Schritte des Gehorsams tun. Diese praktischen Schritte des Gehorsams kann und wird die Kirche mit ihren Getauften nur so vollziehen, dass sie sich stets durch den Heiligen Geist zum Dienst in der Welt und zum Antritt ihres Erbes erneuern lässt" (*Die Verheissung der Taufe* [Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1966], p. 178).

[1] Arthur Darby Nock, *Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background* (Harper Torchbooks; New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964), p. 126.

[2] The ontological realization of resurrection life is apparently first found in Paul's "gnostic" opponents in Corinth, against whom large sections of I Corinthians appear to have been written. The correlation of the gnostic phrase quoted by pseudo-Paul in II Tim. 2:18 ("the resurrection has already occurred"), with the situation reflected in I Corinthians was first made by Julius Schniewind, and is now widely accepted in German New Testament scholarship. For an excellent summary and critical analysis of the discussion as it relates to I Corinthians, see Erhardt Güttgemanns, *Der leidende Apostel und sein Herr: Studien zur paulinischen Christologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), pp. 62-70.

[3] Baptism was considered the vehicle for realizing eschatological resurrection existence among the Valentinians (cf. Tertullian *De praescr. haer.* 33; Epistula ad Rheginum), Menander and his followers (cf. Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 1. 17 [Harvey, I, 195]; Tertullian *De anima* 50. 1; Ps.-Tertullian *Adv. omn. haer.* 1; Justin *I Apology* 26. 4; Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 3. 26).

primarily within a communal setting.[1] This presupposition paved the way for conceiving of the structure of the eschatological community as well as the kind and quality of the relationships between its members as dominantly otherworldly in nature and significance. In comparative religions, material earthly phenomena are commonly regarded as significant and meaningful primarily by virtue of their correspondence to transcendent, celestial archetypes.[2] In the ancient Near East, local temples or sanctuaries were frequently regarded as reflections of their heavenly prototypes. This mythical view of the Temple as a sacred place which mediates between time and eternity is found not infrequently in the Old Testament[3] and is developed and increasingly presupposed in Judaism,[4] the New Testament[5] and early Christianity.[6] If Judaism could regard the

[1] *Supra*, pp. 12f.

[2] Eliade, *Cosmos and History*, pp. 1-48; *idem*, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, pp. 367-87.

[3] This views seems to be reflected in Exodus 24-31, where Yahweh reveals the pattern according to which the Tabernacle together with its furniture is to be modelled. De Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, II, 328-29, expresses some reservations regarding the hypothesis that the heavenly temple was regarded as the prototype of the earthly Israelite temple. Similar reservations are expressed by Helmer Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, trans. David Green (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), pp. 163-64.

[4] Cf. H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1951). According to Yigael Yadin, the recently recovered "Temple Scroll" contains a divinely dictated plan for rebuilding the Temple at Jerusalem. It is Yadin's considered opinion that the Qumran community's refusal to worship at the Herodian Temple was based on the conviction that the building was not constructed in accordance with the divine plan.

[5] In the New Testament this "Platonic" view is expressed most clearly in the letter to the Hebrews. Speaking of the Tabernacle and the sacrificial rites of the Old Testament, the author says, "Thus it was necessary for the copies of the heavenly things to be purified with these rites, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ has entered, not into a sanctuary made with hands, a copy of the true one, but into heaven itself . . . (9:23-24). See the discussion of Sidney G. Sowers entitled "The Shadow of the Heavenly and Eschatological Cult," in his book *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews* (Basel Studies of Theology, No. 1; Richmond: John Knox Press, 165), pp. 105-12.

[6] The Valentinians, as the names which they gave to the various celestial aeons might imply, viewed the created universe as a poor copy of the Pleroma: "Ignorante itaque Demiurgo universa, Salvatorem dicunt honorasse Pleroma in conditione per Matrem, similitudines et imagines eorum quae sursum sunt emittentem" (Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 2. 5. 1 Harvey, I, 265; cf. 2. 7. 1). A related conception is the Jewish Christian view of the church as a pre-existent, heavenly reality (Hermas *Vis.* 2. 4; II Clement 14:1). Another closely related conception is the conviction that the profane world

material Temple as a microcosm of heavenly dwelling of Yahweh, then the metaphorical use of "temple" and temple imagery for the people of God opens up the possibility of regarding an empirical community as a reflection and extension of its heavenly prototype and counterpart.[1]

In the letters of Ignatius of Antioch particularly, the local earthly hierarchy of the Christian community is regarded as an extension and reflexion of its heavenly counterpart. Ignatius, with his unique early emphasis on the monarchical episcopate, regards each local Christian community as an empirical manifestation of the universal church. Each local community is a microcosmic model of the universal or heavenly church which is united to God through Jesus Christ. In a realistic sense the local bishop represents God or (alternately) Jesus Christ. The presbyters stand in the same relation to the bishop as the apostles stood (and continue to stand) to Jesus Christ. For Ignatius, therefore, church organization must be viewed as an extension and reflection of a heavenly reality. The strong emphasis which he places on unity or oneness with the divinely ordained local church officers is one mode of conceptualizing the present realization of eschatological salvation, for the soteriological goal of the earthly community is the heavenly union with God through Jesus Christ. This salvific unity, which Ignatius considers the eternal and final destiny of all true Christians, functions in an anticipatory way in the earthly setting in which all believers find themselves. Since the organization and unity of the earthly community provides the context in which eschatological salvation may be proleptically experienced, for Ignatius the church is truly an eschatological community.

In the Fourth Gospel we find a strong emphasis on unity and on the necessity for persevering in belief without an explicit correlation of these themes with a corresponding emphasis on the soteriological significance of church order and discipline; indeed, the latter emphases are wholly lacking. Rudolf Bultmann contrasts the Ignatian emphasis on organizational unity with the Johannine emphasis on unity in the tradition of the Word and faith.[2] This

---

is the unreal world (cf. Eliade, *Cosmos and History*, p. 92): Evangelium Veritatis 17:18-25; Epistula ad Rheginum 48:13-19; Ode of Solomon 34:4.

[1] Cf. Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

[2] Rudolf Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (17. Aufl. Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), pp. 392f.

distinction is completely artificial since the conception of unity in Ignatius includes yet transcends that of organization. It will be seen in our study of the Fourth Gospel that the sphere in which eschatological salvation may be experienced as a present reality is always and only that of the local Christian community, and that the Ignatian emphasis on church order and discipline is not contradictory but rather complimentary to the Johannine emphases on unity and perseverance.

Christian Ethics Conceived as a Present Manifestation of the Possession of Eschatological Salvation

The ethical norms of early Christianity were largely a heritage from Judaism, and consequently had a communal rather than an individual orientation. Unlike the largely amoral state religions and cults of the Graeco-Roman world, ethics and religion were inseparably linked in Judaism as well as in early Christianity.[1] In some phases of early Christianity, the ethical expression of Christian piety must be viewed as the external social manifestation characteristic of the present possession of eternal life, the chief blessing of eschatological salvation. This is particularly evident in Paul, for whom ethics and eschatology were inextricably interrelated.[2] In Colossians 3:1-3, for example, Paul exhorts Christians to seek τὰ ἄνω and to set their minds on τὰ ἄνω, μὴ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. The vice list in 3:5-9 is characterized as τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, implying that the virtue list in 3:12ff. should be designated as τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς οὐρανίας, i.e., as eschatological qualities of life which should and must be realized within this present age or world.

In Johannine literature, "love" (with its correlative "obedience") is an eschatological quality of life which permeates the interpersonal relationship of believers within the Johannine community (n. b. that nothing is said about loving unbelievers). Just as "(eternal) life" is primarily a divine quality which is mediated to the believing community through Jesus Christ and his *alter ego* the Spirit-Paraclete, so "love" as the primary manifestation of the possession of eternal life is also a unique attribute of God (cf. I John 4:16: "God is love, and he who abides in love abides in God, and God abides

---

[1] Mowinckel, *Religion und Kultus*, p. 121.

[2] Cf. Victor Paul Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul* (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968), pp. 214-16.

in him."). For Ignatius the correlates "love" and "faith" have a similar function. As conditions of life, the ethical dimension of these terms is the external manifestation of the conditional possession of life and immortality, the chief benefits of eschatological salvation.

Asceticism as a Vehicle for Realizing the Benefits of Eschatological Salvation

While the origins of Christian ascetic practises is a complex problem which continues to remain clouded in obscurity,[1] one of the early motivations for expressing ascetic piety is rooted in eschatology. Less concerned with a negative posture toward material creation than with a positive attempt to approximate some of the dimensions of eschatological existence within the context of worldly conditions, early Marcionite asceticism is an excellent example of one significant mode of conceptualizing eschatological salvation as a realized phenomenon.

The basic Marcionite conception of eschatological salvation was the transformation of believers into an angelic mode of existence and experience. In spite of Marcion's anti-Jewish posture, it will be recognized that this traditional conception of final salvation has its roots in Jewish apocalyptic thought, and is an aspect of what we have referred to above as the Paradise motif. Taking Luke 20:34-36 as a basic point of departure, and linking the attainment of resurrection life with the Christian rite of Baptism, Marcion demanded that initiants to his church practise the celebate life. It is therefore apparent that Marcion regarded the rite of Baptism as the effective means for actualizing an individually and ontologically realized form of eschatological salvation which necessitated present conformity to what was conceived to be the future mode of eschatological heavenly existence. This connection between Baptism and the angelic mode of life was not unique to Marcion, for it was also an early characteristic of Syrian Christianity as mediated to Marcion by Cerdo the Syrian Gnostic.

---

[1] One of the major weakness of Arthur Vööbus' ambitious work *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, 2 vols. (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Vols. CLXXIV and CLXXV; Louvain: Van den Bempt, 1958), is his brief and inadequate discussion of the origins of asceticism in the piety of the Qumran community.

The Proclamation of the Gospel

Within the context of worship, the proclamation of the word of God through the agency of prophetic personalities (cf. Käsemann's "sentences of holy law"), the cultic *hieros logos*, is one of the vehicles through both eschatological life and eschatological judgment are communicated. A different yet related manifestation of the powers of the age to come within the cultic assembly was the performance of miraculous deeds "in the Spirit." [1] In the Johannine community these manifestations of eschatological salvation penetrated beyond the bounds of the cultic assembly and characterized the evangelical mission of the community to their Jewish contemporaries. In this sense, the community proper, and individual believers by extension, function as a *Christus prolongatus*. Just as the Johannine Jesus possessed the divine gift of eternal life, so did the Johannine community. Just as the Johannine Jesus was able to communicate this divine life to those who responded to his message with belief, so did the Johannine community. Just as the Johannine Jesus was endued with the authority to pronounce proleptic judgment upon those who rejected his message, so was the Johannine community. Similarly, just as the possession of divine life through organic and dynamic union with the Father made the communication of that life possible through the miraculous deeds of healing for the Johannine Jesus, so the performance of even greater deeds was made possible for the Johannine community through their derivative possession of eternal life.

Application of the Thesis to a Controlled Typological Grouping of Interrelated Texts

In the surviving literature of early Christianity, the phenomenon of realized eschatology is primarily to be found in the Fourth Gospel and the Odes of Solomon.[2] It is therefore entirely appropriate that our task of relating realized eschatology to its cultic setting concern itself with these texts. These texts, together with the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch, are widely regarded as having a

[1] Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, p. 88.

[2] In view of the strong emphasis on realized eschatology within the Odes of Solomon, it is difficult to account for the fact that Martin Werner has made only one reference to them (so far as I can tell; only the English translation of his work contains an index) in his important book *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, p. 125, n. 66.

very close relationship on a number of levels. In the following study, this core grouping of decidedly Christian texts are flanked by the Dead Sea Scrolls and the reconstructed religious though of Marcion of Sinope. The multi-leveled phenomenological similarities which exist between these five bodies of texts are such that some kind of genetic relationship is rendered highly probable. Since these texts either represent or are related to phases of early Syrian Christianity, a distinct variety of early Christianity centering in Edessa whose significance and importance has only begun to be realized and assessed,[1] it is hoped that the following study will illuminate at least one aspect of the history of Christian thought in this region.

One of the significant advantages of applying a single thesis to a group of interrelated texts exhibiting typological similarities is that the correlated results of the investigation should be less idiosyncratic and more representative of a common development within early Christian life and thought. No single document which has survived from early Christianity preserves an accurate microcosmic delineation of the religious thought of its author, the community out of which it arose, or the geographical region which it ostensibly represents. The inherent limitations imposed by the use of certain literary forms, by the purpose of the author, authors or author-editors, and by personal idiosyncrasy cannot be ignored. A severe limitation must therefore be imposed on the use of the *argumentum e silentio*, an argument used so lavishly and imaginatively by Walter Bauer in his epoch-making book *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, ed. Georg Strecker (2nd ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1963).[2]

Before launching into a consideration of the cultic orientation of realized eschatology within the Qumran community, let us first consider those factors which legitimate our treatment of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Fourth Gospel, the Letters of Ignatius, the Odes of Solomon and the reconstructed religious thought of Marcion of Sinope as an interrelated grouping of texts.

---

[1] Cf. L. W. Barnard, "The Origins and Emergence of the Church in Edessa During the First Two Centuries A. D.," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XXII (1968), 161-75; G. Quispel, "The Discussion of Judaic Christianity," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XXII (1968), 81-93.

[2] Note the criticism which has been leveled at Bauer for his use of this argument extensively and fallaciously by Hans-Dietrich Altendorf, "Zum Stichwort: Rechtgläbigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LXXX (1969), 64.

1. Each of these texts either originated in Syria or is somehow connected with early Syrian Christianity. Of the four hypothecated provenances of the Fourth Gospel (Ephesus, Alexandria, Palestine and Antioch), there appears to have been a movement in recent years toward the Antiochian hypothesis.[1] Although the Letters of Ignatius were written in Asia Minor, there is little doubt that the religious thought expressed in them must somehow be representative of the major concerns of Antiochian Christianity.[2] Of the four main theories of the geographical origin of the Odes of Solomon (Ephesus, Alexandria, Antioch and Edessa), most scholars now prefer either Antioch or Edessa.[3] The immense amount of literature which has arisen over the question of the phenomenological relationship between the Dead Sea Scrolls and Johannine literature necessitates the consideration of this body of Jewish literature in any discussion of Syrian Christianity.[4] Points of contact between the literature from Qumran (particularly the Ḥodayoth) and the Odes of Solomon serves to strengthen the supposition that the Dead Sea Scrolls are not unrelated to early Syrian Christianity.[5] If

[1] Cf. the discussion, literature and conclusions in Werner Georg Kümmel, Paul Feine and Johannes Behm, *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. A. J. Mattill, Jr. (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 175.

[2] Ignatius' use of diatribe rhetoric clearly contradicts the hypothesis of a Hellenistic school education. There is significant evidence that he represents a variety of Christianity strongly impressed by Judaism. Cf. Jean Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, trans. John A. Baker (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964), pp. 39-42.

[3] Cf. J. de Zwaan, "The Edessene Origin of the Odes of Solomon," *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake*, ed. Robert P. Casey, Silva Lake and Agnes K. Lake (London: Christophers, 1937), pp. 285-302; Robert M. Grant, "The Odes of Solomon and the Church of Antioch," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXIII (1944), 363-77; A. F. J. Klijn, *Edessa, Die Stadt des Apostels Thomas: Das älteste Christentum in Syrien*, übers. von Manfred Hornschuh (Giessen: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1965).

[4] A thorough discussion of the literature on the subject up through 1962 may be found in the section entitled "Johanneische Fragen" in Herbert Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, II (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966), 118-43.

[5] Points of contact between the literature from Qumran and the Odes of Solomon were first noted by J. Daniélou, F.-M. Braun and M. Testuz. For more lengthy discussions, see K. Rudolf, "War der Verfasser der Oden Salomos ein 'Qumran-Christ'?: Ein beitrag zur Diskussion um die Anfänge der Gnosis," *Revue de Qumran*, XVI (1964), 523-55; J. Carmignac, "Un Qumanien converti au Christianisme: l'auteur des Odes de Salomon," *Qumran-Probleme: Vorträge des Leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961*, ed. Hans Bardtke (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963), pp. 75-108.

the tradition that Marcion of Sinope was decisively influenced by Cerdo the Syrian Gnostic is taken seriously (and we shall see that there is very good reason indeed to do so),[1] then there is ample justification for linking him with the group of texts which form the object of our investigation.

2. Each of these texts also share a common religio-historical background: a gnosticizing tendency within Jewish Christianity. It is precisely at this point, however, that scholarly discussion exhibits all the order of a barroom brawl. Unless the merging typologies of "Gnosticism" and "Jewish Christianity" are carefully defined and differentiated, the future of such discussion remains bleak indeed. While some scholars see a form of nascent gnosticism in the Dead Sea literature (O. Cullmann, H. J. Schoeps, G. Quispel), others are equally convinced that there is nothing even remotely "gnostic" about the Qumran literature (W. D. Davies, B. Reicke, R. McL. Wilson). Similarly, the proto-gnostic [2] character of the Fourth Gospel,[3] the Letters of Ignatius [4] and the Odes of Solomon [5] has been both vigorously advocated and just as vigorously disputed by reputable scholars. While there is certainly more contemporary

[1] *Infra*, pp. 218f.

[2] The Messina Colloquium on Gnosticism suggested that the term "Gnosticism" be reserved for the fully developed religious systems which flourished in the second century A. D., while "gnosis" be applied to the constituent elements which pre-date second century Gnosticism; cf. *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo: Colloquio di Messina 13-18 Aprile 1966*, ed. U. Bianchi (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), p. xxvi. R. McL. Wilson, *Gnosis and the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), p. 9, accepts this distinction, but in view of the fact that the adjective "gnostic" can do duty for both Gnosticism and gnosis, prefers additional qualification (such as we have made above) through the use of terms such as "pregnostic," "semi-gnostic," "gnosticising," etc.

[3] See the discussion and literature cited in Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 154-61.

[4] The influence of gnosis on Ignatius has been assumed by many but particularly emphasized by Heinrich Schlier, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen*, (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, Nr. 8; Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1929); Hans-Werner Bartsch, *Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition bei Ignatius von Antiochien* (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, Nr. 44; Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1940); *idem*, "Ignatius von Antiochien," *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3rd ed., vol. III, 665-67.

[5] The best recent discussion of this question, with an excellent resume of critical opinion, is James H. Charlesworth, "The Odes of Solomon—Not Gnostic," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XXXI (1969), 357-69. Cf. the survey by Kurt Rudolph, "Gnosis und Gnostizismus: Ein Forschungsbericht," *Theologische Rundschau*, XXXIV (1969), 214-24.

agreement in linking Marcion with early second century Gnosticism, even here there is a minority report which questions the propriety of using this typology to describe his religious thought. Regardless of precisely where one chooses to draw the line between gnosis and Jewish Christianity, it is difficult to deny that each of the texts under discussion shares to some extent a common religio-historical background, the center of gravity of which has yet to be precisely defined.

3. Closely related to the previous point is the fact that each of these texts shares to an amazing extent a common subject matter, conceptual world of thought and religious terminology. There is presently a *communis opinio* among scholars that the closest parallels to the Fourth Gospels are to be found in the Letters of Ignatius, the Odes of Solomon and Mandean literature.[1] The primary terminological parallels which are shared by the Fourth Gospel, the Letters of Ignatius and the Odes of Solomon (as well as the Dead Sea Scrolls), include such terms as Word, Grace, Faith, Knowledge, Truth, Light, Love and Living Water. One formal stylistic feature which is shared to some extent by the Fourth Gospel, the Odes of Solomon and the Qumran Ḥodayoth are the revelatory "I-sayings" which recur in all three bodies of literature.[2] Finally, it should be noted that although Marcion used a revised edition of the Gospel of Luke as a constituent element of his New

---

[1] The following commentaries on the Fourth Gospel use the Letters of Ignatius, the Odes of Solomon and Mandaean literature as the most important sources for parallels: W. Bauer, *Johannes* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1912); Rudolf Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*; Hugo Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel Interpreted in Its Relation to Contemporaneous Religions Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World* (Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner, 1929). It should be pointed out that the theory of a pre-Christian Gnosticism has largely fallen from favor, and that consequently the use of the Mandaean texts, which do not antedate the seventh century A. D., is methodologically suspect. Although each of the commentaries noted above was produced at least a generation ago, the emphasis on the significance of these texts as parallels to the Fourth Gospel continues on unabated; cf. W. Werbeck, "Johannesevangelium," *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3rd ed., vol. III, col. 847.

[2] For a typical *religionsgeschichtliche* approach to these revelatory "I-sayings" see the posthumous work by H. Becker, *Die Reden des Johannesevangeliums und der Stil der gnostischen Offenbarungsrede* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Neue Folge, Heft 50; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956). For a consideration of these "I-sayings" in the Fourth Gospel and the Odes of Solomon, cf. *infra*, pp. 72f., 174ff.

Testament canon, the textual excisions which he made produced a gospel which resembled the Fourth Gospel with respect to framework, while the content remained synoptic in character.[1] One can only conclude that Marcion's conception of what a gospel ought to be (the story of a divine being) presupposed the kind of gospel which the Fourth Gospel actually was. It cannot be stated with any degree of certainty that Marcion knew but rejected the Fourth Gospel, but it does seem reasonable to assume that Marcion did share some significant presuppositions with the author of the Gospel of John. It does not seem unreasonable to suppose that these presuppositions are derived from some phase of early Syrian Christianity.

4. Finally, all of the texts under consideration (with the obvious exception of the literature from Qumran) were written within the period A. D. 90 to 135. Since the early post-apostolic period (the so-called "tunnel period") has produced a relatively small quantity of literature which may be located firmly both geographically and chronologically, those documents which may be so located assume a greater historical importance than they might otherwise possess.

---

[1] Robert M. Grant, *The Earliest Lives of Jesus* (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1961), pp. 11-12.

CHAPTER TWO

THE PRESENT REALIZATION OF ESCHATOLOGICAL SALVATION IN THE QUMRAN COMMUNITY

INTRODUCTION

The superstructure of "konsequente Eschatologie" which Albert Schweitzer boldly erected upon the foundation of Jewish apocalyptic eschatology has long exhibited basic structural defects. Now the instability of the foundation itself has been revealed through the disclosure that our picture of first century Jewish apocalyptic thought has been remarkably incomplete. Although the great bulk of apocalyptic literature was written during the three centuries bounded by the Maccabean revolt and the revolt of Bar Kokhba, only six books or parts of books are seriously regarded as having been composed before the Fall of Jerusalem in A. D. 70: Daniel, I Enoch 1-36, 72-108, Jubilees, the Sibylline Oracles (Book 3), the Psalms of Solomon, and sections of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. The common practise of constructing models of apocalyptic eschatology for the period prior to A. D. 70 based on evidence contained in Jewish apocalypses composed after that period is certainly a procedure which is methodologically suspect.[1] The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, an extensive library produced by an apocalyptic Jewish sect in Palestine which flourished for almost two centuries prior to the cataclysmic events of A. D. 66 to 73, has radically altered our picture of the religious thought of that period. These texts have also proved to have immense significance for students of Christian origins.[2]

One of the imposing barriers which has impeded recognition of the fact that present and future aspects of salvation were maintained

---

[1] Even a brief examination of such an erudite work as Paul Volz' *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*, reveals the extent to which his depiction of Jewish eschatology has been determined by apocalypses composed after A. D. 70 (particularly the apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch), thereby producing a leveling of the data. The basic flaw in Albert Schweitzer's reconstruction of apocalyptic thought contemporaneous with both Jesus and Paul was that he either ignored or incorrectly evaluated the dating of apocalyptic literature.

[2] Cf. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*.

in tension in the eschatological teaching of Jesus has been the hitherto well-founded assumption that the apocalyptic eschatology of first century Palestinian Judaism was completely future-oriented.[1] Even those who have emphasized the juxtaposition of present realization and future hope in the eschatology of Jesus have designated this factor as one of the major elements of discontinuity between Jesus and his historical background.[2] If the comparatively recent (and growing) recognition that the community which produced the Dead Sea Scrolls held a tension between the present realization and future fulfilment of eschatological salvation can be confirmed, then this factor should have a decisive impact on the study of Jesus and Christian origins.[3]

[1] In continuity with the methodology and hypotheses of Albert Schweitzer, Martin Werner has developed the former's principle of "konsequente Eschatologie" into a criterion of historicity in opposition to the historical methodology of form critics. Assuming that only the future realization of the sovereignty of God is consistent with late Jewish apocalyptic thought, Werner thinks he is able to eliminate as secondary any indications of a present realization of God's sovereignty from the authentic Jesus-traditions contained in the synoptic gospels. He thoroughly discusses the methodological and historical ramifications of this approach in *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, pp. 36-79. Although the rug appears to have been pulled out from under "konsequente Eschatologie" as a model for establishing a criterion of historicity by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the basic historical methodology of Schweitzer and Werner has not been invalidated. Once the complexion of first century Jewish apocalyptic eschatology has been revised in the light of the literature from Qumran, it will serve as a useful model for distinguishing authentic Jesus-material from later ecclesiastical accretions; cf. David E. Aune, "The Problem of the Messianic Secret," *Novum Testamentum*, XI (1969), 1-31.

[2] This discontinuity has been stressed particularly by W. G. Kümmel (cf. *supra*, p. 4). In *Promise and Fulfilment*, p. 153, Kümmel says "Yet such an examination . . . of the contemporary Jewish beliefs in God shows one thing beyond all doubt: had Jesus announced only God's future eschatological action, then his eschatological preaching, however much it contrasted with apocalyptic and diverged from the Jewish conception of law, would have remained in essential agreement with the late Jewish expectation of salvation; and this looked for no salvation in the present and so the preaching about the future could find expression *only* in hope." The same emphasis is found in Oscar Cullmann, *Salvation in History*, trans. Sidney G. Sowers (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967), p. 172: "The *new element* in the New Testament is not eschatology, but what I call the *tension* between the decisive 'already fulfilled' and the 'not yet completed', between present and future." In the same book Cullmann criticizes N. A. Dahl's contention that the Qumran community held a form of realized eschatology by calling attention to the "fact" that a genuine tension is lacking in Qumran (*Ibid.*, p. 172, n. 2). Dodd, *Parables of the Kingdom*, p. 34, also observes that the proclamation of the presence of the kingdom of God has no parallel in Jewish teaching or prayers of the period.

[3] In an article entitled "Erwägungen zum Problem von Gegenwart und

The Thesis of Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn

Although a number of scholars have made desultory references to the supposed realized eschatology of the Qumran community, this thesis has only recently been placed on a firm methodological and exegetical foundation by Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn in his Heidelberg dissertation, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran.*[1] Kuhn proposes the thesis that in addition to the customary future expectation characteristic of Jewish apocalyptic, the Qumran community was also conscious that eschatological salvation had already entered the present age in the history and experience of the community.[2] After briefly presenting the essential characteristics of the community's future expectation,[3] Kuhn attempts to substantiate the hypothesis that the sectarians also held a realized form of eschatological salvation through the painstaking exegesis of four sections of three select hymns: 1QH 3:19-36, 1QH 11:3-14, 1QH 11: 15ff., and 1QH 15.[4]

On the basis of 1QH 11:3-14 and 1QH 3:19-36, Kuhn enumerates five eschatological acts which are actualized and appropriated in the present age by those who have become members of the commun-

---

Zukunft in der paulinischen Eschatologie," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, LXIV (1967), Peter Stuhlmacher assumes the correctness of Kuhn's thesis for his own work on Pauline eschatology (p. 427, n. 8).

[1] Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran* (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, Bd. 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966). On pp. 13f. of this book, Kuhn refers to a number of scholars who have expressed the opinion that the Qumran community did know a form of realized eschatology; references to a number of scholars whom Kuhn does not mention will be noted in the ensuing discussion. A number of students of the Fourth Gospel have been quick to note the existence of realized eschatology in the literature from Qumran, but have failed to make any significant use of this recognition: Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John, I-XII* (The Anchor Bible, Vol. XXIX; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1966), p. cxix; J. N. Sanders and Brian Mastin, *The Gospel According to St. John* (Harper's New Testament Commentaries; New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968), p. 359, n. 3; Leon Morris, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and St. John's Gospel* (London: Dr. G. Campbell Morgan Memorial Lecture, June 15, 1960), p. 6.

[2] Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, p. 11.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 34-43. Perhaps the best guide to the scholarly discussion of the eschatology of the Dead Sea Scrolls is to be found in Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, II, 265-86.

[4] Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, pp. 44-112.

ity: (1) resurrection (11:12),[1] (2) new creation (3:21; 11:13), (3) communion with angels (3:21-23; 11:13f.),[2] deliverance from the

[1] This point, the only one open to serious question as far as I am concerned has been disputed by M. Delcor, Review of *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil*, by H.-W. Kuhn, *Journal of Semitic Studies*, XIII (1968), 277-80.

[2] Communion or companionship with angels is also recognized as an aspect of realized eschatology by J. Licht, "The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll," *Israel Exploration Journal*, VI (1956), 101 (an article apparently unknown to Kuhn): "The companionship of the angels is claimed *through* membership of the sect. As every man elected to grace and belonging to the sect is granted in some degree the ability to praise, so the whole sect, which constitutes the company of the elect, is engaged in the praise of the Lord, as DST [1QH] expressly states several times. It is thus a choir parallel, so to speak, with the choirs in heaven. The company of the elect as a whole deems itself 'to belong in one lot with the angels of the presence.' By joining the sect our author becomes somehow a citizen of heaven, an almost superhuman being." Menahem Mansoor cites 1QH 3:21-23 as evidence for the participation of the sectarians in heavenly songs of praise for the Almighty; cf. *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, Vol. III; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961), p. 79. Cf. also Otto Betz, "The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai-Tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament," *Revue de Qumran*, VI (1967), 91: "These passages 1QH 3:22 and 1QS 11:7-8 suggest that the members of the Qumran community have now already an invisible communion with angels. In the YḤD of the realized eschaton, this communion will be made perfect for all those whom God will cleanse with the Holy Spirit (1Q Serek IV, 22), and the Qumran priests will then serve the temple of God's kingdom like the angels of the presence (1Q Blessings IV, 25-26)."

The same mode of conceptualizing eschatological salvation as a present cultic experience is found in the Angelic Liturgy. J. Strugnell, in an article which constitutes the *editio princeps* of this fragment entitled "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran—4Q Serek šîrôt 'ôlat haššabbāt," *Congress Volume* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, Vol. VII (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960), p. 320, observes: "Of great significance for the study of post-biblical liturgies is the manner in which the motive of the angelic cult in the Heavenly Temple is, to say the least, meditated upon in the context of the Essene Sabbath liturgy. This is no angelic liturgy, no visionary work where a seer hears the praise of angels, but a *Maśkîl's* composition for an earthly liturgy in which the presence of the angels is in a sense invoked and in which—an idea to which there are parallels is [sic!] Christian and Jewish literature after the Epistle to the Hebrews—the Heavenly Temple is portrayed on the model of the earthly one and in some way its service is considered the pattern of what is being done below." Since the Qumran community conceived of earthly and heavenly worship of God as mutually interpenetrating, a clear rationale is provided for their strict and rigid adherence to the ritual calendar (I owe this suggestion to Prof. Otto Betz). The frequent use of the number seven in the Angelic Liturgy calls to mind the heptadic structure of the Apocalypse of John, thereby disposing us to view its cultic realization of the kingdom of God and final judgment as historically and genetically related to the identical cultic phenomenon in the worship of the Qumran community (against Thompson, "The Form and Function of Hymns in the New Testament," p. 157: "In the Apocalypse of John the hymnic

final power of the realm of death (3:19),[1] and (5) proleptic eschatological transference to heaven (3:20).[2] In each case the context makes it abundantly clear that each of these eschatological acts or states of existence define aspects of the content of an eschatological salvation which was realized in the present experience of the community.

In a more general way 1QH 11:15ff. characterizes eschatological salvation as consisting in joy, forgiveness of sins and the end of sorrow. The final prayer in 1QH 11:33 makes it certain that this depiction of the blessings of eschatological salvation has already become part of the author's experience: "Thou hast done all these things!" [3] In 1QH 3:21 forgiveness serves as an explanation of the significance of the "new creation," while in 11:10 forgiveness is seen as the starting point for the realization of eschatological salvation within the framework of the Qumran community. Joy is associated with the eschatological experience of communion with angels in 1QH 3:23 and 11:14. Finally, it is clear from 1QH 15 that the "time of peace" which has become realized in the present experience of the community (15:15-16), is parallel to the future day of punishment for evildoers (15:17). Here too the blessedness

---

material has a cultic setting and a cultic function . . . That which is to come is experienced in the liturgy as a present, actual reality. This is not the function of the hymnic material in the Jewish pseudepigraphs and related literature from the Greco-Roman period.").

[1] Essentially the same conclusion has been reached independently by Otto Böcher, *Der johanneische Dualismus im Zusammenhang des nachbiblischen Judentums* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus; Gerd Mohn, 1965), pp. 120-21: "Es war schon oben davon die Rede, dass in der nachbiblisch-jüdischen Eschatologie zwischen der älteren apokalyptischen Literatur einerseits und Qumran andererseits ein deutlicher Bruch besteht. Während etwa für Daniel, äthiopischen Henoch und Test. XII die Totenauferstehung am Ende der Zeit mit anschliessendem ewigen Leben der Gerechten ein wichtiges Theologoumenon darstellt, tritt diese Erwartung in *Qumran* zurück. Statt dessen sprech die Texte der Sekte im *Präsens* von der Überwindung des Totenreichs (1 QH iii. 19f.): Wer in der Sekte lebt, lebt in der Endzeit!"

[2] Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, p. 114. The proleptic eschatological transference to heaven discussed by Kuhn is described within the Scrolls by the use of a great variety of imagery, most of which can be related to the Paradise motif (cf. *infra*, pp. 37-42). See the short discussion of this motif in Johann Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer*, Bd. 2: *Anmerkungen* (Basel and München: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag, 1960), pp. 89-91, 97-100. The present corporate experience of a transference to Paradise is an important mode of conceptualizing eschatological salvation in the realized eschatology of the Odes of Solomon (cf. *infra*, pp. 185ff.).

[3] Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, p. 115.

of future salvation is conceptualized as having already become part of the present experience of the community.

Kuhn then turns to a lengthy discussion of the problem of whether or not the consciousness of the presence of the Spirit of God within the community was understood as an eschatological gift, or as the means whereby the future eschatological salvation had become actualized in the present experience of the community.[1] After emphasizing the fact that the activity of the Spirit was predominantly limited to the past and the future in rabbinic, apocryphal and pseudepigraphal Jewish literature.[2] Kuhn tentatively concludes that the presuppositions necessary for regarding the Spirit as an eschatological gift were indeed present in the Qumran community.[3] However, we must add to Kuhn's discussion the

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 117-39. It should be noted that the problem that Kuhn is discussing at this point is not whether or not the community was conscious of the present possession of the Spirit, for this fact can be denied only with great difficulty (cf. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, II, 652: "Das Neue in der qumranischen Geistlehre gegenüber dem üblichen Judentum ist die *volle Gegenwart des Geistes* . . ."). Rather, Kuhn is concerned with determining whether the possession of the Spirit may appropriately be designated an eschatological gift, i.e., the means whereby aspects of eschatological salvation are realized within the community.

[2] See the lengthy discussion of this subject in Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924), II, 123-38. Cf. also W. Bieder and E. Sjöberg, "*Pneuma*, etc.," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, VI, 370, 384-86.

[3] Kuhn's reluctance to affirm unequivocally that the presence of the Spirit was considered the means whereby future eschatological blessings were mediated to the community in the present age is based on his conviction that critical judgment cannot attain a satisfying solution to this problem (*Enderwartung*, p. 139). He finds three primary objections to this conclusion: (1) none of the relevant texts views the gift of the Spirit clearly as an eschatological event, (2) none of these texts contains allusions to the relevant Old Testament prophecies such as Joel 3:1ff., and (3) the four sections of the three hymns exegeted on pp. 44-112 of his book contain no mention of the present activity of the Spirit (*Enderwartung*, p. 136). In spite of these difficulties, however, Kuhn does conclude that the gift of the Spirit was conceived as an eschatological event by the community: "Nachdem wir nun festgestellt haben, dass der Glaube an die Gegenwart des Geistes in den Gemeindeliedern *an sich* schwerlich eschatologisch zu verstehen ist, muss nun doch noch auf einiges verwiesen werden. Es ist wichtig zu sehen, dass die Struktur des Redens von der Gegenwart des Geistes in den Gemeindeliedern genau die gleiche ist, wie sie in der Apokalyptik für die Zukunft vorliegt: Da die Gabe des Geistes mit dem Eintritt in die Gemeinde verbunden ist, ist der Fromme mit ihrer Mitteilung *in eine neue Existenz ersetzt*, und der Geist gilt der *ganzen* Gemeinde. Es handelt sich also weder um ein Charisma in *besonderen Augenblicken* noch um ein Charisma für *besondere*

observation that, in contrast with the belief in early Christianity, the Qumran community still looked forward to the miraculous giving of the Spirit in a more complete form at the visitation of Yahweh (1QS 4:20-22). The importance of this difference cannot be minimized.

Another important and closely related problem which Kuhn discusses concerns the gift of knowledge which occupies such a significant place in the religious thought of the Scrolls.[1] Since apocalyptic literature regards knowledge or wisdom as one of the blessings which will accompany eschatological salvation,[2] Kuhn very properly asks whether the sect's claim to possess esoteric divine knowledge may not be another facet of their present experience of the reality of eschatological salvation. After underlining the fact that esoteric salvific knowledge is exclusively related to the future in Jewish apocalyptic, Kuhn goes on to demonstrate that within the Qumran Ḥodayoth this soteriological wisdom is regarded as already realized in the present.[3] As in the case of the gift of the Spirit, Kuhn concludes that the gift of knowledge claimed by the community was indeed regarded as an eschatological gift.[4]

Einzelne" (*Ibid.*, p. 139). It might be parenthetically noted that the dual conception of the Spirit in the early church (as a possession of all believers and as a special manifestation of divine power), cannot be exclusively linked with Hellenistic Christianity since it has precedence in Qumran (cf. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 153-64; Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament*, pp. 39-41).

[1] Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, pp. 139-75. The eschatological character of "knowledge" in Qumran is recognized by W. D. Davies, "Knowledge in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30," *Christian Origins and Judaism* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), pp. 119-44. See also Helmer Ringgren's discussion of "knowledge" in the Qumran literature in *The Faith of Qumran*, trans. Emilie T. Sander (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963), pp. 114-20, and J. Licht, "The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll", pp. 97-99.

[2] Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, pp. 150-51. In John 4:25, eschatological knowledge is connected with the expected Messiah: "When he comes, he will teach us all things." As the *alter ego* of Jesus, a similar role is envisoned for the Spirit-Paraclete in John 16:13, a role which had been realized within the Johannine community. On this question see Otto Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959).

[3] Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, p. 163: "... die Mitteilung des Offenbarungswissens in den Gemeindeliedern entgegen dem apokalyptischen Offenbarungsverständnis ein Geschehen ist, das den Frommen mit seinem Eintrit in die Gemeinde in die Heilssituation versetzt, also soteriologischen Sinn hat. Aber auch in bezug auf den Inhalt der geoffenbarten Geheimnisse dort ausschliesslich auf das *zukünftige* Heil beziehen, ist in unseren Liedern der Inhalt der Geheimnisse im besonderen das sich schon in der *Gegenwart* in der Qumran Gemeinde verwirklichende Heil."

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 175.

Kuhn concludes his monograph with a discussion of the meaning and emergence of the particular variety of eschatology espoused by the Qumran sectarians. With regard to the meaning or particular understanding of eschatology found within the community, Kuhn stresses two points: (1) since the future expectation was not eliminated by the community, the juxtaposition of present and future aspects of eschatology must be viewed as temporally and historically determined (i.e., there is no possibility of finding an atemporal eschatology in Qumran),[1] and (2) the Qumran community alone is the sphere in which future eschatological salvation has entered the present age.[2]

The emergence or origin of the eschatology of the Qumran community is traced by Kuhn to two sources: (1) the future expectation of the community is derived from Jewish apocalyptic thought, while (2) the present realization of eschatological salvation derives from the priestly tradition.[3] While Kuhn's emphasis on Jewish apocalyptic as one of the bases of the particular developments reflected in Qumran eschatology is certainly correct, his attempt to derive the phenomenon of realized eschatology in Qumran from the priestly "Selbstverständnis" lacks clarity. Starting with the observation that in Israel past events could be made contemporary within a cultic context, Kuhn states that "working out from the same thought, it must basically be possible that the future and the present might also merge."[4] Kuhn goes on to conclude that in Qumran it is the "Tempelverständnis" or "Tem-

---

[1] Kuhn's emphasis on the temporal nature of Qumran eschatology must be seen in the light of dialectical theology's attempt to de-temporalize early Christian eschatology (cf. *supra*, p. 1f.).

[2] Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, p. 179. Cf. Böcher, *Der johanneische Dualismus*, p. 124: "Das spannungsreiche Nebeneinander präsentischer und futurischer Eschatologie findet sich zwar nicht in den Texten des AT oder etwa der Testt XII—hier ist schon das Aufkommen apokalyptisch-eschatologischer, selbstverständlich auf die Zukunft gerichteter Hoffnungen bemerkenswert—, wohl aber in den Schriften der Qumransekte. Während einerseits die Mitgliedschaft in der Sekte als Teilhabe am eschatologischen Heil verstanden wurde, wird andererseits die Zuversicht laut, Gott werde einst den dualistischen Kampf zwischen den Söhnen des Lichts und der Finsternis beenden. Solange die Gegenwart als Kriegszeit gilt (1 QM 1, 1f. 10f.), als deren Abschluss die Beseitigung der feindlichen Herrschaft durch Gott erwartet wird (1 QM 18, 11), kann von einer nur präsentischen Eschatologie nicht die Rede sein."

[3] Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, p. 182: "Wir vergegenwärtigen uns noch einmal, dass die Apokalyptik und das priesterliche Selbstverständnis zwei Grundpfeiler der theologischen Struktur der Qumrangemeinde sind."

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 183.

pelsymbolik" of the community which allows the sectarians to blur the distinction between "now" and "then" by conceiving of the community as the place where the heavenly and earthly dwelling place of God merges.[1]

Kuhn seems unaware of the fact that the cultic actualization of past events or of primal conditions is, as we have already pointed out,[2] a relatively common phenomenon in comparative religions. The conception of the eschaton in Qumran (and in Jewish apocalyptic generally) as a *restitutio principii*—thereby accounting for the lavish use of the Paradise motif—differs from other religions only through the conception of the theophanic nature of history. Although Kuhn sees the complex of Temple imagery and symbolism as an outgrowth of the priestly tradition, and the locus for the community's conception of itself as an eschatological phenomenon, he completely omits any mention of the Paradise motif or of any elements from the constellation of imagery and symbolism which make up that motif. In the following paragraphs, it will be our purpose to delinate briefly the way in which eschatological salvation was conceptualized in terms of the Paradise tradition, the relation between this tradition and what Kuhn has termed the eschatological transference to the heavens ("Versetzung in den Himmel"). and finally, the way in which each of the modes of realizing eschatological salvation in the present experience of the community may be related to the Paradise tradition.

Realized Eschatology and the Paradise Motif

The author of the Ḥodayoth compares the inspired word which flows from his lips to a fountain in Eden (1QH 8:16-20), and the community is likened to a tree watered by all the rivers of Eden (1QH 6:14-17), This protological imagery, derived from Biblical

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 185: "Entsprechend dem hebräischen Raum- und Zeitverständnis ist also auf Grund der 'Tempelsymbolik' die Gemeinde der Ort, wo die strenge Scheidung zwischen Erde und Himmel, zwischen Jetztzeit und eschatologischer Heilszeit nicht zutrifft." Although I cannot disagree with Kuhn's sentiments, they would bear a great deal more significance if he had correlated them with studies in comparative religion. Furthermore, temple symbolism is not to be considered the *cause* of the community's belief in the present realization of eschatological salvation, but rather one of the modes of conceptualizing the presence of final salvation, a conceptualization made possible on other grounds.

[2] *Supra*, pp. 7ff.

tradition, is transformed into eschatology when the author expresses his soteriological goal as restoration to Eden (1QH 7:23-25): [1]

> And thou, O my God, hast succoured my soul
> and lifted up my horn on high.
> And I will shine with a seven-fold light
> in the Eden which thou hast made for thy glory.
> For thou art an everlasting light unto me
> and hast established my feet on an infinite plain.

While this passage seems to indicate clearly that the author and his congregation have already experienced this eschatological goal in the present time, the final return to Paradise can only occur after the period of wickedness has been brought to an end (4QH171 2:10). The final restoration of man to his primal state is described in 1QS 4:6-8 in imagery very similar to that used in the Odes of Solomon: [2]

> As for the Visitation of all who walk in this (Spirit),
> it consists of healing and abundance of bliss,
> with length of days and fruitfulness,
> and all blessings without end
> and eternal joy in perpetual life,
> and the glorious crown and garment of honour in everlasting light.

In 1QS 4:23, it is claimed that the glory of Adam will belong to the sons of light, and elsewhere the eschatological goal of the community is described as everlasting life and the attainment of the glory of Adam (CD 3:19-21; 1QH 17:15). In one of the fragments of the Commentaries on the Psalms, it is claimed that the penitents of the desert will live one thousand generations in uprightness, and that they and their seed will possess the inheritance of Adam forever (4QH171 3:1-2).

The belief in the eschatological restoration of primal conditions has a long history in Judaism, and was one of the ways in which Isaiah and his school conceptualized the eschatological state.[3] The

---

[1] Quotations from the Dead Sea Scrolls are generally those of A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, trans. G. Vermez (Meridian Books; Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1962).

[2] *Infra*, pp. 185ff.

[3] Cf. Isaiah 11:6-9 (within a context later interpreted as messianic), and Isaiah 65:17-25; Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, Vol. II: *The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Traditions*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965), pp. 169f.

reinstatement of Edenic conditions became increasingly important in late Jewish apocalyptic, as IV Ezra and II Baruch clearly illustrate.[1] Eden or Paradise was considered the only proper environment in which eschatological salvation could be realized, while Adam in his pre-Fall state of innocence and blessedness became the paradigm for what man would again become upon his restoration.[2]

According to Jewish legends, Adam [3] was originally created as an immortal heavenly being of gigantic stature,[4] clothed in radiant celestial garments [5] placed in the third heaven, in Paradise.[6] As a result of his disobedience, he was expelled from the heavenly Paradise to earth, with the consequent loss of immortality, diminution of stature and surrender of his brilliant celestial garments. The restoration of man to the primal state from which he had

---

[1] Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*, pp. 360f.; "Gilt der Stand des Adam und des Paradieses als seliger Urstand, dann ist an die allgemeinmenschliche Seligkeit gedacht. Der neue Mensch der Heilzeit, jeder Heilsgenosse, bekommt die Güter, die Adam vor dem Fall hatte oder hätte bekommen können . . ." Cf. also W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue* (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1907), pp. 225f.; R. H. Charles, *Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Schocken Books, 1963), pp. 316-18; J. Jeremias, *"Paradeisos," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, V, 765-73.

[2] Adam traditions certainly lie behind Paul's conception of the Christian man "being renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Col. 3:10); cf. Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, trans. Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), p. 174.

[3] A mass of Jewish legendary material on Adam has been collected by Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, Vol. I: *Bible Times and Characters from the Creation to Jacob* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1913), pp. 47-102; elaborate documentation is given in Vol. V: *Notes to Volumes I and II from the Creation to the Exodus* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1925), pp. 63-131. Another great collection of material, but with a more pronounced eschatological orientation is that by Benjamin Murmelstein, "Adam: Ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XXXV (1928), 242-75; XXXVI (1929), 51-86. A more recent and wide-ranging summary of ancient Adam-Anthropos speculation is given by Egon Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus: exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm. 5:12-21 (1. Kor. 15)*) (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, Bd. 7; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), pp. 15-157.

[4] Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, III, 325.

[5] *Ibid.*, IV, 887.

[6] *Ibid.*, III, 531-34.

fallen was characterized by the renewed possession of eternal or perpetual life, freedom from sorrow, disease and pain, repossession of a crown or garland and reinvestiture with a celestial garment, joyful participation with angelic beings in the praise and worship of God. Since Adam was thought to have been originally like the angels of God, the souls of the righteous were expected to undergo a transformation into the angelic nature as a prelude to their readmission to Paradise.[1]

Functionally, the possibility of eschatological transference or transport to the heavens provides a suitable environment in which the blessings of eschatological salvation may be realized in the present experience of the community. Basically, this experience—we should have to call it realized protology in other religions—has close parallels in comparative religions with one major difference: in Qumran and phases of early Christianity this experience was apparently a corporate one which took place in a cultic setting; in other religious this experience seems limited to individual religious technicians in extra-cultic contexts.[2]

[1] *Ibid.*, I, 891. Cf. II Baruch 51:5, 10: ". . . in the heights of that world shall they dwell [i.e., in Paradise, cf. 51:11], and they shall be made like unto angels, and be made equal to the stars [cf. Dan. 12:2-3], and they shall be changed into every form they desire, from beauty into loveliness, and from light into the splendor of glory." The same expectation is attested in the literature of Qumran: "thou shalt be as an angel of the face in the dwelling-place of Holiness" (1QSb 4:25); cf. 1QS 11:8. A similar protology was preserved by the Samaritans in the Ḥilluk: "Know that the state of those who will dwell hereafter in the Garden of Eden will be like unto the state of Adam in the Garden of Eden, when God put him there; they will live there like unto the angels of heaven, in splendour and glory, clothed in light and free from every evil thing, pure, free from defilement, holy, no evil inclinations among them, men and women without carnal intercourse, just as our father Adam and Eve, whom he did not know until after he had left this place; for after their going out from the Garden the Lord says, 'And Adam knew his wife Eve', and the righteous ones will be gathered into the Garden with the prophets and the pure ones, and their work will be the singing of praise and songs unto the glory of God, who gave them these good gifts" (Moses Gaster, *Samaritan Eschatology*, I [London: The Search Publishing Company, 1932], p. 182).

[2] In a chapter entitled "Nostalgia for Paradise in the Primitive Traditions," Mircea Eliade observes that ". . . by means of special techniques, the shamans endeavor to rise above the present condition of man—that of *man corrupt*—and to re-enter the state of the primordial man described to us in the paradisiac myths" (*Myths, Dreams and Mysteries*, trans. Willard R. Trask [Harper Torchbooks; New York; Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967], pp. 60-61). Since it was not until after the "Fall" that man became what he is today (moral, sexed, at enmity with animals, obliged to work, to feed and clothe himself), "the shaman abolishes the present human

If the Ḥodayoth functioned as cult-hymns used in corporate worship by the Qumran sectarians,[1] then the experience of transference to the heavenly realms and the singing of hymns of praise to the Almighty in the company of angels is primarily a cultic actualization of the final eschatological state of the community. Similarly the communal meal described in 1QSa appears to be a reflection or an anticipation of the final messianic banquet at which the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel will preside (cf. 1QS 6:3-5),[2] and the specific mention of the presence of angelic beings in this assembly (1QSb 2:8-9) means that this cultic assembly provides an appropriate setting for understanding similar statements in the Ḥodayoth (1QH 3:21-23; 11:13-14).

Finally, we should underline the fact that each of the five eschatological acts which Kuhn finds were actualized in the cultic assembly of the community is related to the Paradise motif. "Resurrection" and deliverance from the final power of the realm of death are basically concerned with recovering the perpetuity

---

condition and, for the time being, recovers the situation as it was at the beginning" (Mircea Eliade, *Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy*, trans. Willard R. Trask [Bollingen Series, Vol. LXXVI; New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1964], p. 99). The shaman can ascend to the primordial realm because he carefully controls the techniques of ecstasy (*Ibid.*, p. 182). However, what the shaman can do today in ecstasy is that which could be done at the dawn of time by all human beings *in concreto* (*Ibid.*, p. 486). Jewish sources contain references to a number of individuals who entered Paradise in a state of ecstasy (cf. b. Haggigah 14b, and J. Abelson, *Jewish Mysticism* [London: G. Bell and Sons Ltd., 1913], pp. 47-8: "It was strongly believed that the pious could, by means of a life led on the highest plane, free themselves from the trammels that bind the soul to the body and enter, living, into the heavenly paradise."). Paul records a similar experience in II Corinthians 12:3-4, which perhaps suggests that "nostalgia for Paradise" is one of the older types of Christian mystical experience (Eliade, *Shamanism*, p. 508). The researches of Gershom Sholem have underlined the probable antiquity of Jewish Merkabah ("chariot") mysticism, which appears to be a development of the kind of mystical experiences ascribed to the four rabbis in Talmudic tradition and Paul in II Corinthians (cf. Gershom Sholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* [New York: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960]).

[1] Cf. Ringgren, The Faith of Qumran, pp. 15f.

[2] For discussions of the communal meal in Qumran as liturgical anticipation of the final messianic banquet, see Frank Moore Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (rev. ed.; Anchor Books; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961), pp. 85-91; Karl Georg Kuhn, "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. Krister Stendahl (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1957), pp. 65-93; Matthew Black, *The Scrolls*

of life which Adam lost through his disobedience.[1] Communion or companionship with angels reflects the restoration of Adam to his position as a glorious heavenly being among other heavenly or angelic beings.[2] Expectation of a new creation, together with the present realization of some of its dimensions within the community (the experience of joy, forgiveness of sins and the cessation of sorrow), is based on the conviction that present worldly conditions are inappropriate for a restoration of primordial, Edenic conditions of life.[3] Finally, the cultic experience of eschatological transference to the heavenly realms—an experience which has functional parallels in comparative religions—is the realization of the proper environment in which an experience of eschatological salvation in the present time is rendered possible.

Conclusions

The chief merit of Kuhn's study,[4] from the perspective of the present discussion, has been to carefully delineate some of the major ways in which the Qumran community conceptualized eschatological salvation as a phenomenon realized in the present time within a cultic and communal setting. With respect to the Qumran community, then, it is impossible to speak of a strict and rigid division between the present age and the age to come. While the terminology of the two ages found in pseudepigraphic and rabbinic literature is absent from the literature of Qumran,[5] the idea itself

---

and Christian Origins (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1961), pp. 110-11. Against the interpretation of 1QSa 1:29-2:1 in this way, see Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, pp. 35-36.

[1] There is no explicit mention of Adam's disobedience as the source of mankind's sinful nature within the scrolls; CD 2:16ff. does reflect the view that evil originated in the angelic lust depicted in Genesis 6:1-4.

[2] Cf. Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, pp. 66-73 ("Exkurs I: Die Gemeinschaft mit den Engeln in den Qumrantexte").

[3] Cf. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, p. 171.

[4] In a number of reviews of Kuhn's book, the authors have expressed the judgment that he is on the right track, and that he has succeeded in proving the thesis which he sets out to demonstrate; cf. J. Murphy-O'Connor, Review of *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil*, by H.-W. Kuhn, *Revue Biblique*, LXXV (1968), 439-45; H. Goedhart, Review of *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil*, by H.-W. Kuhn, *Revue de Qumran*, VI (1968), 437-41. The opposite conclusion has been expressed by K. Müller, Review of *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil*, by H.-W. Kuhn, *Biblische Zeit*, XII (1968), 303-6.

[5] Thus far, Paul Volz' suggestion that this terminology may not have come into use until after A. D. 70 has not been contradicted (*Die Escha-*

is undeniably present. The present era is described as the "days of the dominion of Beliar" (1QS 2:19; 1QM 14:9),[1] the "times of the blindness of Israel" (CD 16:2-3), and the time" of ungodliness" (CD 15:10). CD 4:12-13 and 6:14-15 make it clear that the community regarded the present time of difficulty which they were experiencing as the period of messianic woes which other Jewish apocalyptic writers envisioned as immediately preceding the consummation of the world.[2] Because of this conviction, prophecies which refer to the eschatological blindness and stubbornness of Israel are applied to the unfolding of contemporary events (Hosea 4:16 is so used in CD 1:13, and Isaiah 27:11 in CD 5:16-17).

Nevertheless, in spite of the firm hold which Beliar has over the present era, the domination of God is not limited, as in traditional apocalyptic eschatology, to the eschaton. The dominion of God and the dominion of Beliar are viewed as juxtaposed (1QS 3:20-21; cf. 1:18, 24), and both are factors in the present experience of the community. This macrocosmic dualism also has its microcosmic aspect.[3] The Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Perversity battle for supremacy in the heart of each man (1QS 4:23); the sectarians express the desire not to "keep Beliar" in their hearts (1QS 10:21). Those outside the community are referred to as "men of the lot of Beliar" (1QS 2:4-5). This satanic opposition to righteousness has had a long history, for when Moses and Aaron were raised up by the hand of the Prince of Light, Beliar raised up Jannes and Jambres in opposition (CD 5:17-19). Presumably the raising up

---

tologie der jüdischen Gemeinde, p. 66). When H. Sasse claims to find the terminology "this age/the age to come" as far back as the first century B. C., it is in the Similitudes of Enoch (chapters 37-71 of I Enoch), which can no longer placed before A. D. 70 with any degree of certainty (*"Aiōn, aiōnios," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, I, 206).

[1] A similar view has been incorporated into the shorter ending of Mark found in Codex Freerianus: "This age of lawlessness and unbelief is under Satan." The Clementine Homilies (20:2; 15:7) also subscribe to the view that the present age has been given over to evil. The Ebionites asserted that the Devil has possession of the present age, while Christ has the age to come as his lot (Epiphanius *Panarion* 30. 16. 2).

[2] For a discussion of the messianic woes in Jewish apocalyptic thought see Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*, pp. 147-63, and Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, IV, 977-86.

[3] The correlative use of the terms "macrocosmic/microcosmic" in this context was first employed by B. Otzer, as noted by O. Böcher, *Der johanneischen Dualismus*, p. 73.

of the Teacher of Righteousness at the end of days is also considered to be an act of the Prince of Light. The Angel of Darkness is continually on the offensive, causing the sons of light to stumble through the agency of the malevolent spirits (1QS 3:24). This evidence indicates that members of the Qumran community experienced the age to come within their community as they yielded themselves to the Spirit of Truth. Since only by divine visitation could the present conflict be brought to a conclusion (1QS 3:18), the temporal and historical character of the future expectation of the Qumran community are clearly complimentary.

The fact that aspects of final eschatological salvation were realized within a cultic and communal setting by members of the Qumran community supplies us with a basic approach to the problem of the significance of realized eschatology within the Fourth Gospel, the Letters of Ignatius, the Odes of Solomon and the religious thought of Marcion of Sinope.

CHAPTER THREE

THE PRESENT REALIZATION OF ESCHATOLOGICAL SALVATION IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Introduction to the Problem

In the present consideration of the Fourth Gospel in the light of our thesis, we will be at pains to delineate what we conceive to be the crux of the real problem inherent in the emphatic Johannine emphasis on realized eschatology. The focal point of the problem is not merely the paradoxical juxtaposition of present and future, but rather the proper understanding of the meaning and function of the phenomenon of realized eschatology within the Johannine community, together with an understanding of the precise mode or modes whereby eschatological salvation was believed to constitute an essential factor in the present experience of the community. The discussion of the real nature of the problem of Johannine eschatology will occupy the major portion of the introductory section of this chapter.

Since the quest for the cultic setting of realized eschatology in the Fourth Gospel cannot satisfactorily be made apart from a determination of the internal ecclesial situation and the external socio-religious environment out of which the Gospel arose, we shall deal extensively with that crucial topic in the next section. There we will attempt to construct a profile of the religious character of the Johannine community in terms of its values, needs and aspirations. The construction of this profile is based on the presupposition that the Johannine Jesus was not only the product of historical memory coupled with traditional Christological modes of conceptualizing the soteriological significance of Jesus, but also (and primarily) the product of the retrojection of the religious needs, values and aspirations of the Johannine community back into the life of the "historical" Jesus. It was primarily in this way that the major characteristics of the religious experience, piety and life of the community were found to be legitimated, determined and directed by the life of the Johannine Jesus.

Realized eschatology in the Fourth Gospel should therefore be viewed not as a reflective and ordered answer to one or more

internal or external problematic situations or developments which confronted the community, although the importance of these factors cannot be underestimated. Rather, realized eschatology must be viewed as a forthright expression of the piety or spirituality of the Johannine community. The piety of the community is not only inseparable from the cultus (the central means whereby communion and communication between the exalted Jesus and his earthly community is experienced, celebrated and perpetuated), but it is precisely the cultus which determined the form as well as the content of the piety expressed in the ethics, preaching and teaching of the community.

Since the religious experience and values of the community radiated from the cult, in the final section of the present chapter we will attempt to link each of the major ways in which realized eschatology is expressed in the Fourth Gospel to its communal or cultic setting. The four primary ways in which future eschatological salvation was conceptualized as a phenomenon in the present religious experience of the community are: (1) the possession of the Spirit-Paraclete, (2) the possession of the benefits of eschatological salvation conceived comprehensively as "eternal life," (3) the belief that the present consequence of unbelief was immediate divine condemnation or judgment, and (4) the cultic "coming" of Jesus as the Son of man who dispenses both life and judgment.

A review of the scholarly contributions to the subject of Johannine eschatology for the last forty years [1] reveals the astonishing fact that the great majority of such studies have been motivated, whether positively or negatively, by Rudolf Bultmann's 1928 article entitled "Die Eschatologie des Johannes-Evangeliums." [2] His approach to the subject was later systematically applied to the Fourth Gospel in his 1941 Meyer Commentary, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*. Here, as in many other areas of New Testament research, the reknowned Marburg *Neutestamentler* and theologian has had and will continue to have a profound and lasting influence.

In spite of the intensive amount of scholarly research which

[1] A complete bibliography on the subject, including books, book reviews and articles, may be found in the compilation of Edward Malatesta, *St. John's Gospel*, 1920-1965 (Analecta Biblica, No. 32; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967).

[2] Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Eschatologie des Johannesevangeliums," *Zwischen den Zeiten*, VI (1928), 4-22; reprinted in *Glauben und Verstehen*, I (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1961), 134-52.

has been devoted to the question of Johannine eschatology, there continues to be a relatively small amount of agreement in crucial areas, with the main divisions of opinion suspiciously reflecting national boundaries. Without exaggeration it could be said of the current stage of discussion of the constellation of questions which make up the so-called "Johannine problem" that the question of Johannine eschatology ranks as the most important, chiefly because of the far-reaching implications which the solution of this problem has for other aspects of Johannine thought and theology.[1]

With respect to methodology, it should be noted at the outset that the phenomenological similarities exhibited by the Fourth Gospel and the First Letter of John make it evident that essentially the same historical, cultural and religious milieu is reflected. Leaving to one side the moot question of common authorship, both documents will be used judiciously in the present study to illuminate the problem of Johannine eschatology.[2] Since the source-critical analysis of both the Gospel and First Letter of John has hitherto been markedly unsuccessful, both documents will be regarded as unities in their present textual unities in their present state (with the exception that the twenty-first chapter of the Fourth Gospel will be regarded as a later addition).[3] The First

[1] The "solution" to the problems presented by Johannine eschatology (in our opinion) is largely dependent upon the reconstruction of the original situation in the life of the late first century Christian community or communities out of which Fourth Gospel arose. The significance of this presupposition for the present treatment of Johannine eschatology will become clear when we embark on the task of reconstructing the *Sitz im Leben der johanneischen Gemeinde* which (we believe) gave rise to the peculiar emphases found in Johannine eschatology. The frequently quoted judgment of Adolf von Harnack underlines the difficulties inherent in any investigation of the Fourth Gospel: "Moreover, the origin of the Johannine writings is, from the stand-point of a history of literature and dogma, the most marvellous enigma which the early history of Christianity represents . . ." (*History of Dogma*, trans. Neil Buchanan [New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1961], I, 96).

[2] Such a methodological assumption has excellent precedent in the procedure of many adherents of the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, most notably Wilhelm Bousset in *Kyrios Christos*, p. 154, n. 3: "Ich behandle die johanneische Literatur als eine Einheit, trotzdem ich an ihre literarische Einheit nicht glaube. Aber religionsgeschichtlich bildet sie eine Einheit, abgesehen von einigen wenigen Punkten, die in der Darstellung hervorgehoben sind." Cf. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, II, 3. Aside from phenomenological similarity there is also a great deal to be said for common authorship of the Gospel and the First Letter; cf. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 310-12.

[3] Cf. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 307-9.

Letter of John and the twenty-first chapter of the Gospel have in common the fact that they constitute the earliest commentaries on the Gospel itself.

The Tension Between Present and Future Aspects of Johannine Eschatology

The customary approach to the subject of the eschatology of the Fourth Gospel begins by stating and substantiating what has by now become a well-recognized fact: realized eschatology achieves a greater dominance in the Gospel of John than any other New Testament document.[1] Since the present text of the Fourth Gospel contains elements of eschatology which can only be described as futuristic or apocalyptic (these terms are not synonymous), the problem presented by Johannine eschatology may be defined as the attempt to resolve or relate the tension between the predominantly (and uniquely) realized emphasis on eschatology within the Fourth Gospel, and the marginal affirmation regarding futuristic or apocalyptic eschatology. However, in James Moffatt's book *The Theology of the Gospels*, we find the surprising statement that "there is no real problem of eschatology in the theology of the Fourth Gospel." [2] Moffat can make this claim only because he views the real eschatological problem within the gospels as the reconciliation of the synoptic paradox of the proximity and distance of future events in the teaching of Jesus.[3] Johannine eschatology is not problematic for Moffatt because of its essentially and predominantly realized character. We must disagree completely with him in that it is precisely the realized aspect of Johannine eschatology which constitutes the essence of the problem with which we must deal.

[1] So Oscar Cullmann, *Salvation in History*, trans. Sidney G. Sowers (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967), p. 269; W. Howard, *Christianity According to St. John* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946), p. 113; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, cxvii: "In many ways John is the best example in the NT of realized eschatology." These approaches are to be contrasted with that of Ernst Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus*, trans. Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968). Käsemann does not feel that "realized eschatology" is the most appropriate catchword which can be used to characterize Johannine eschatology (pp. 7of.), nor does he feel that this is the proper way to open a discussion on the subject of the eschatology of the Fourth Gospel.

[2] James Moffatt, *The Theology of the Gospels* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1912), p. 44.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

Although the crux of the problem presented by Johannine eschatology lies elsewhere, we must at this point briefly discuss the ways in which the tension between present and future aspects of Johannine eschatology has been treated in scholarly discussion. They are three in number.

1. There is first of all the view that accepts the realized character of Johannine eschatology as thoroughly characteristic of Johannine theology; references to apocalyptic eschatology are consequently regarded either as redactional intrusions into the original text of the Gospel or as otiose survivals in the nonlogical development of the theology of the Fourth Evangelist. Although the monolithic authority of Rudolf Bultmann is usually thought of in connection with the redactional hypothesis, it should be recognized that similar judgments were antecedently made by many other German, British and American scholars.[1] However, the architectonic conception of the composition and redaction of the Fourth Gospel which has found expression in Bultmann's famous commentary on the Gospel of John has justly placed his perspective on the redactional elements in the Fourth Gospel at the forefront of recent criticism and debate.[2] It must be recognized at the outset that Bultmann's elimination of apocalyptic elements in the text of the Fourth Gospel is closely related to his elimination of sacramental elements as well. Apart from Bultmann and his *Schüler*,[3] the present stage of research on this aspect of the Gospel reveals an increasing tendency to be hesitant in the ascription of

[1] An example of the critical reconstruction of the text of the Fourth Gospel which bears out this statement is that of the Yale scholar, B. W. Bacon, *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, ed. Carl H. Kraeling (New York: Holt, 1933), pp. 137, 186, where he concludes that John 5:28, 29 are the insertions of a redactor, and p. 168, where Bacon concludes that the same is true of John 3:5 and 6:51b-58. G. H. C. MacGregor, *The Gospel of John* (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1928), pp. 146ff., passes the same judgment on John 5:28-29, as does the German scholar H. H. Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1886), I, 249-51. Wendt also rejected as interpolations John 6:39, 40, 44, 54; 12:48. John 5:28-29 was also rejected by Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 428f.

[2] Cf. Dwight Moody Smith's comprehensive treatment of this aspect of Bultmann's views in *The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's Literary Theory* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1965).

[3] Cf. G. Bornkamm, "Die eucharistische Rede im Johannesevangelium," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLVII (1956), 161-69, and E. Lohse, "Wort und Sakrament im Johannesevangelium," *New Testament Studies*, VII (1960-61), 110-25.

apocalyptic and sacramental elements within the Gospel to the work of a redactor.[1] This state of affairs has come about in part because of a deflation of the self-confidence with which source critics at the turn of the century were able to reconstruct ancient texts by means of excision, rearrangement and emendation. Another contributory factor has been the careful analysis of Johannine style which has tended to pull the rug from under the assumption that such supposed interpolations were excised through objective criteria.[2] Stylistic analyses of the Fourth Gospel seem to have undercut the supposed "objective" basis for redactional hypotheses, revealing that Bultmann was primarily motivated by subjective or theological criteria in his isolation of redactional elements inserted or modified by the so-called ecclesiastical redactor. It must, however, be recognized that futurity alone was not the rationale which Bultmann used to exclude "eschatological" passage, but rather the conceptualization and coloring of futurity in terms of apocalyptic ideas and imagery.[3] Such passages as John 17:24, which conceives of the final destiny of believers in eschatological unity with the Father and the Son, are regarded by Bultmann as thoroughly Johannine inasmuch as they reflect Johannine congruence to Gnostic eschatology.[4]

The main passages which are judged by Bultmann to be redactional additions to the Fourth Gospel by virtue of their apocalyptic coloring are: (1) John 5:28-29 (referring to the final resurrection of both the just and the unjust),[5] John 6:51b-58 (the eucharistic

---

[1] This is most clearly evident in the three most recent and significant treatments of Johannine eschatology: L. van Hartingsveld, *Die Eschatologie des Johannesevangeliums* (Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp., 1962); Josef Blank, *Krisis: Untersuchungen zur johanneischen Christologie und Eschatologie* (Breisgau: Lambertus-Verlag, 1964); Paolo Ricca, *Die Eschatologie des vierten Evangeliums* (Zürich und Frankfurt a. M.: Gotthelf-Verlag 1966).

[2] The more significant treatments of Johannine style include Eduard Schweizer, *Ego Eimi: Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneischen Bildreden, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939); E. Ruckstuhl, *Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums* (Fribourg: S. Paul, 1951); B. Noack, *Zur johanneischen Tradition: Beiträge zur literarkritische Exegese des vierten Evangeliums* (København: Rosenkilde, 1954).

[3] Smith, *The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 217.

[4] Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, pp. 397-98.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 196f. One overlooked argument which provide evidence for regarding John 5:28-29 as a non-Johannine interpolation can be derived from Ignatius of Antioch. If it is granted that Ignatius knew the Fourth Gospel and was dependent on it to some degree (so C. Maurer, *Ignatius*

appropriation of eternal life),[1] (3) John 6:39, 40, 44, 54 (the resurrection "on the last day"),[2] and (4) John 12:48 (the final judgment).[3] The crux of the problem raised by the presence of these apocalyptically colored eschatological references within the Fourth Gospel lies in whether or not the interpreter believes that they can be harmonized with the main emphasis of Johannine eschatology, the realized aspect.[4] It is important to realize that whether or not one grants authenticity to any or all of the above-mentioned passages, the problem presented by the phenomena of Johannine eschatology is far from a solution. On the contrary, the assumption that the apocalyptically colored passages belong within the context of the Evangelist's eschatological outlook only complicates an already difficult problem. This is primarily because (as we shall see), the key to the solution of the eschatological problem of the Fourth Gospel lies not in the reconciliation of present and future elements (or the removal of one or the other), but rather in the determination of the precise reason why the Fourth Gospel, in contrast with the remainder of first century Christian literature, is so dominated by realized eschatology. We proceed, therefore, on the assumption that each of these apocalyptically colored passages, taken individually or in their totality, is not inconsistent with the over-all eschatological scheme of the Fourth Gospel.

Another aspect of this solution is that in which the dominance of the realized element of Johannine eschatology is related to the marginal affirmations of futuristic or apocalyptic eschatology by ascribing the apocalyptic passages to the non-logical thought of the Evangelist, or else to an attempt by the Evangelist to accomodate himself to current views. A significant representative of the former position is E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology* (Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1908). The strength of Scott's position lies in the fact that such otiose eschatological

---

von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium [Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1949]), and it is similarly recognized that Ignatius did not believe in a final resurrection of both the just and the unjust (Smyrn. 7:1; 4:1), one could conclude that since such a belief is reflected in John 5:28-29, that passage had not yet found a place in the version of the Fourth Gospel known to Ignatius.

[1] Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, pp. 161, 174.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 174-77.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 262-63.

[4] This position is explicitly discussed by Bultmann, "*Zōē*, etc.," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, II, 870ff.

statements are not infrequently found in the writings of late New Testament literature,[1] and in the Apostolic Fathers.[2] If erratic boulders are allowed to clutter the theological landscape of other Christian authors, one might argue, is there any reason why the Fourth Evangelist should not be allowed his fair share of debris?[3] A more contemporary representative of this position is M. É. Boismard,[4] who relegates the apocalyptic passages to an earlier stage of the Evangelist's developing thought, while the emphasis on realized eschatology represents the mature thought of the author of the Fourth Gospel. A typical representative of the latter position, that the Evangelist has accomodated himself to current views, is H. J. Holtzmann in his book *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie*.[5] The net result of regarding the apocalyptic elements of Johannine eschatology as otiose survivals in the non-logical thought of the Evangelist, or as accomodations to current eschatological views is essentially the same as the redactional view: apocalyptic elements are eliminated as factors integral to the thought of the Fourth Evangelist.

2. Another approach to the solution of the relationship between present and future elements of Johannine eschatology is to place the emphasis on the future elements. Assuming that futuristic eschatology dominates the thought of the Fourth Gospel (a view contrary to the opinion of the overwhelming majority of Johannine scholars), this view relegates the present appropriation of the benefits of eschatological salvation to a position of such subjection

[1] In an article entitled "Apologia for Primitive Christian Eschatology," *Essays on New Testament Themes*, trans. W. J. Montague (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 41; Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1964), pp. 169-95, Ernst Käsemann stresses the fact that although the old language of imminence is still retained in II Peter, the theological significance and position of that belief has been considerably changed.

[2] Rudolf Bultmann, "Ignatius und Paulus," *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii* (Haarlem: Erven F. Bohn, 1953), pp. 37-51, argues that Ignatius' affirmations of a final resurrection are only formal affirmations; the significance of such an event in reality has little connection with his theology considered as a whole. But against this view, cf. *infra*, pp. 152 ff.

[3] Cf. Smith, *The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 239: "Yet I think it quite possible, indeed probable, that the Fourth Gospel has been left to us in an unfinished state."

[4] M. É. Boismard, "L'Évolution du théme eschatologique dans les traditions johanniques," *Revue Biblique*, LXVIII (1961), 507-24.

[5] H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie* (2. Aufl.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911), II, 572-84.

to futuristic of apocalyptic eschatology (here the terms are synonymous), that realized eschatology is effectively drained of all independent significance. This position has been advocated in a mild way by G. R. Beasley-Murray,[1] and in an emphatic and thorough-going way by L. van Hartingsveld.[2] The position of Beasley-Murray may perhaps be better understood if one recognizes that his emphasis on futuristic eschatology is largely a reaction to denials that such eschatology could be authentically Johannine. A subsequent article by Beasley-Murray entitled "The Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Apocalypse," [3] makes it clear that his view of the common authorship of the Gospel and the Apocalypse has allowed him to find a greater significance for apocalyptic eschatology within the Fourth Gospel than a consideration of the Gospel alone would warrant. In the recent monograph on Johannine eschatology by van Hartingsveld, a view of Johannine eschatology is espoused which is thoroughly surprising. Assuming, with J. A. T. Robinson [4] and W. C. van Unnik,[5] that the Gospel was composed as an evangelical tract directed to the Jews of the Diaspora, he insists on viewing the eschatological passages of the Fourth Gospel from the perspective of the Old Testament as understood by late Jewish apocalyptic. The net result is that elements of thorough-going apocalyptic eschatology are found behind every bush. Without detailing the deficiences of van Hartingsveld's abortive treatment of Johannine eschatology, we must conclude that, while his monograph exhibits detailed and painstaking exegesis together with a carefully controlled running dialogue with the conclusions of other exegetes, his unwillingness to deal seriously with Johannine affirmations of realized eschatology hopelessly cripples his presentation. Van Hartingsveld's attempt to place realized eschatology at the periphery of Johannine thought can only be regarded as abortive.

3. A final way in which the present and future elements of

[1] G. R. Beasley-Murray, "The Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel," *Evangelical Quarterly*, XVIII (1946), 97-108.

[2] L. van Hartingsveld, *Die Eschatologie des Johannesevangeliums* (Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp.., 1962).

[3] G. R. Beasley-Murray, "The Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Apocalypse," *Evangelical Quarterly*, XVIII (1946), 173-86.

[4] J. A. T. Robinson, "The Destination and Purpose of St. John's Gospel," *New Testament Studies*, VI (1959-60), 117-31.

[5] W. C. van Unnik, "The Purpose of St. John's Gospel," *The Gospels Reconsidered: A Selection of Papers Read at the International Congress on the Four Gospels in 1957* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960).

Johannine eschatology have been treated—the path followed by the majority of Johannine scholars—is to accept the existing tension between these two foci of Johannine eschatology as authentically Johannine. Within this broad position, however, there are a great variety of ways in which Johannine scholars have attempted to make some sense of the distinctive Johannine emphasis.

Oscar Cullman has used his well-known organizational principle of *Heilsgeschichte* as a means of coupling present and future aspects of Johannine eschatology and making the former the presupposition of the latter.[1] Following this same approach, Alf Corell assumes a more dogmatic position by speaking of "true" eschatology. "True" eschatology for Corell cannot have a one-sided future orientation, for then it would not be concerned with the present and would consequently be superficial. When eschatology is reduced to present experience, it degenerates into mysticism, and can only be considered ephemeral. In Corell's words,

> *True eschatology*, we believe, must be related to the future as well as to the present. It belongs to the history of redemption and like all history it has a future as well as a present. But history also has a past and therefore true eschatology must likewise be related to the past.[2]

Another necessary element of "true" eschatology, according to Corell, is that it must be concerned not with the salvation of an isolated individual, but rather with that of the community as a whole.[3] While the *heilsgeschichtliche* schematization of New Testament theology undoubtedly has its valid application to certain writings of the New Testament (particularly Luke-Acts, Paul and the Letter to the Hebrews), it must be recognized that the mythical and existential elements which also provided the Johannine community with conceptual imagery in the formation of their theology can only be reduced to the schema of *Heilsgeschichte* at

[1] Cullmann, *Salvation in History*, pp. 268-91. For Cullmann, the denial of the *heilsgeschichtlich* perspective of the Fourth Gospel is the presupposition for the denial of the tension existing between present and future affirmation within that gospel (*Ibid.*, p. 269). The same solution to the present and future element of Johannine eschatology has been adopted by E. Earle Ellis, *The World of St. John* (Bible Guides, No. 14; London: Lutterworth Press; New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), pp. 37-42, and George E. Ladd, *The Pattern of New Testament Truth* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968), pp. 64-86.

[2] Alf Corell, *Consummatum Est: Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of St. John* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958), p. 6.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

great peril to Johannine intentions.[1] John is certainly not a theologian of *Heilsgeschichte.*

Another variation within the position which accepts both presend and future strands of Johannine eschatological thought as authentic is that which relates the problem of Johannine eschatology to the eschatological problem presented by the entire New Testament. C. K. Barrett, for example, has defined the crux of the problem of Johannine eschatology as the problem of the juxtaposition of apparently paradoxical statements regarding the present and the future:

> It must be recognized that it is not, strictly speaking, a Johannine problem at all. It is a New Testament problem; for throughout the New Testament this tension between a religion now experienced and an eschatological hope of blessedness yet to be, makes itself felt.[2]

Barrett's observation is certainly correct as far as it goes, for any variety of Christian theology which maintains an emphasis on the historical pastness of the redemptive work of Christ together with the future completion of the implications of that redemption contains within it an unresolved tension between present and future. However, the distinctive problem of Johannine eschatology can only be distorted if it is levelled to the kind of problematic presented by other early Christian eschatologies.[3] The focal point of the problem of Johannine eschatology is not the task of solving the paradoxical juxtaposition of present and future statements—although that certainly is an aspect of the problem—but rather the task of understanding the significance of the dominance of the realized aspect of eschatological salvation within the Fourth Gospel.

[1] Only by extraordinary feats of exegetical legerdemain can the strongly mythical component of the Fourth Gospel be construed as integral to Johannine *Heilsgeschichte.* Cf. Robert M. Grant's discussion of this aspect of the Fourth Gospel in *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (rev. ed.; Harper Torchbooks; New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966), pp. 163-75. On p. 173, Grant observes, "Even though the Gospel of John is not fully Gnostic, it remains a fact that *in it we find a portrait of Jesus which is essentially mythological*" (Italics mine). The wisdom motif in particular, which Father Brown and others have seen as determinative for the conceptualization of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel, is essentially a mythical concept unrelated to salvation history.

[2] C. K. Barrett, "Unsolved New Testament Problems—The Place of Eschatology in the Fourth Gospel," *Expository Times,* LIX (1947-48), 302.

[3] James L. Price, "The Search for the Theology of the Fourth Evangelist," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion,* XXXV (1967), 13, where he expresses the opinion that the difference between Johannine and synoptic eschatology is merely one of emphasis rather than substance.

The Johannine Emphasis on Realized Eschatology

Frequently the dominance of the phenomenon of realized eschatology within the Fourth Gospel is directly attributed to the creative and innovative purposes of its author. A great variety of expressions are used by students of the Fourth Gospel to express the way in which John has altered the eschatology of early Christianity which it in turn had taken over from Judaism. Bultmann,[1] Käsemann [2] and Borgen [3] speak of a "reinterpretation" of Jewish eschatology in which the main emphasis is placed on present realization. Sanders and Mastin speak of a "transvaluation" of Johannine eschatology,[4] while others speak of a "transformation" of Jewish eschatology,[5] a "spiritualization" of old apocalyptic traditions,[6] a "correction of a misplaced emphasis" upon future eschatology in the church of John's time,[7] or that the language of eschatology and apocalyptic has been taken over for the purpose of "mysticism," becoming (in effect) internal eschatology.[8] Finally, Bultmann even speaks of the radical demythologization of current eschatological beliefs by the Fourth Evangelist.[9]

Each of these descriptive terms or phrases can be reduced to the

---

[1] Bultmann, "Die Eschatologie des Johannes-Evangeliums," p. 134: "... die alten eschatologischen Begriffe umgedeutet sind."

[2] Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus*, pp. 70f.

[3] Peder Borgen, *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. X; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), p. 2.

[4] Sanders and Mastin, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to John*, p. 13. By "transvaluation" Sanders and Mastin mean the change from temporal eschatology found (for example) in the synoptics, to ontology, i.e., the contrast between the temporal and the eternal. The influence of C. H. Dodd may be seen here.

[5] Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 7.

[6] Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus*, p. 72.

[7] Ellis, *The World of St. John*, p. 37.

[8] Barrett, "Unsolved Problems," p. 303. This emphasis was quite popular in such older works as B. W. Bacon, *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, ed. Carl Kraeling (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1933), pp. 162ff., and E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology* (2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908), p. 8.

[9] Rudolf Bultmann, *Jesus Christ and Mythology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), p. 32: "The eschatological preaching of Jesus was retained and continued by the early Christian community in its mythological form. But very soon the process of demythologizing began, partially with Paul, and radically with John." *Idem, History and Eschatology: The Presence of Eternity* (Harper Torchbooks; New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1957), pp. 47ff.

basic assumption that the author of the Fourth Gospel was an exceedingly creative theologian who consciously altered or transformed the traditional and dominantly futuristic Christian eschatology for one or more reasons.[1] There is little or no evidence of any consequence that any of the proposed motivations for the transformation of current eschatology by the Fourth Evangelist contains more than a shred of validity. Most of these reconstructed motivations are predicated upon unfounded assumptions which have virtually no exegetical basis whatsoever. We shall examine some five alleged motivations for the transformation of current eschatology by the Fourth Evangelist in modest detail to demonstrate that they contribute little or nothing to the solution of the problems posed by the dominance of realized eschatology in the theology of the Fourth Gospel.

1. The assumption that the transformation of Christian eschatology by the Fourth Evangelist was motivated largely by a desire to make a Semitic proclamation comprehensible to the Hellenistic world [2] is dependent on the hypothesis that the world of Greek thought provides the most satisfactory conceptual background for understanding the Gospel of John. This hypothesis is currently out of vogue (as such hypotheses are wont to be), due to the remarkable correspondence between the conceptual world of the Fourth Gospel and that of the Dead Sea Scrolls. While such a position is

[1] It is perhaps to be expected that those who (over)emphasize the significance of the apocalyptic elements within the Fourth Gospel argue vehemently against any assertion that the apocalyptic eschatology with which the Fourth Evangelist was familiar was in any sense "transmuted into a wholly new product" (Beasley-Murray, "The Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel," p. 97), revised, reinterpreted or transformed (van Hartingsveld, *Die Eschatologie*, p. 122). Beasley-Murray wants to emphasize the fact that "eschatological ideas may be expressed in highly diversified ways, and yet remain unchanged" ("The Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel," p. 97). He therefore argues that although there is a different emphasis in the eschatology of the Fourth Gospel, nevertheless it is still harmonious with the rest of New Testament eschatology (*Ibid.*). Van Hartingsveld's main objection to such a transformation is considerably less sophisticated. He wonders how John could ever have found a place in the New Testament canon if its depiction of eschatology were in fact so far removed from, for example, the eschatology of the synoptic gospels (*Die Eschatologie*, p. 122). To this one need only reply that at least a century had elapsed before the Fourth Gospel was completely accepted, and it might also be pointed out that the eschatological beliefs of the fourth century church were far different from those of the synoptic gospels as well as those of the Johannine community.

[2] E. F. Scott, "The New Testament Idea of the Future Life, IV: The Future Life in the Johannine Teaching," *Biblical World*, XXXVIII (1911), 322.

still advocated by C. H. Dodd, C. K. Barrett (to a more limited extent than Dodd), and others, there are few concrete instances within the Gospel where evidence of significant Hellenization can be pointed to which could not have been mediated through first century Judaism. One of the main elements of Hellenistic thought which some scholars think they find in the Fourth Gospel is the emphasis upon spatial rather than temporal dualism.[1] Since both varieties of dualism are found in late Judaism,[2] it is completely misleading and inaccurate to link temporal (or eschatological) dualism to Judaism alone, and spatial (or ontological) dualism to Hellenism alone.

2. Another motivation for the transformation of traditional eschatology which has been attributed to the Fourth Evangelist is either his desire to stress the realized character of eschatology as a corrective to the strong emphasis on apocalyptic eschatology current in the church of his day,[3] or as an answer by the Evangelist to the problem of the indefinite delay of the Parousia.[4] Aside from the fact that these two not unrelated views cancel each other out, there is no firm exegetical basis for the latter view, and virtually none for the former. Some commentators mistakenly see a polemic against traditional eschatology reflected in the dialogue between Jesus and Martha in John 11:21-27.[5] If this really is a polemic against traditional conceptions of the final resurrection held by the older eschatology (which I doubt), it is remarkable that nowhere else in the Fourth Gospel within the context of the Johannine affirmation of the realized character of eschatological salvation is there anything even remotely resembling a polemic against tradi-

---

[1] This misconception is reflected in Sanders and Mastin, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, pp. 13f., and in David Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, No. 5; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1967), p. 196.

[2] Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 293-94: "It can no longer be maintained that the Jewish expressions referred exclusively to the conception of the present age, the present world in contradistinction to the coming world. All depends in this respect upon the contexts. It is only natural that the vertical and horizontal conceptions intermingle."

[3] Ellis, *The World of St. John*, pp. 35, 37.

[4] Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, p. lxxxv.

[5] Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, pp. 306f.; *idem*, *History and Eschatology*, pp. 47f.; Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 429f.; Böcher, *Der johanneische Dualismus*, p. 112.

tional or apocalyptic eschatology.[1] The fact that Lazarus was physically resurrected (despite the possible symbolic import of such a sign), is decisive evidence against viewing the Lazarus narrative as constituting a Johannine emphasis on resurrection as a realized experience of the believer.[2]

In connection with this reconstructed motivation of the Fourth Evangelist, it should also be noted that the lack of explicit reference to the sacraments within the Fourth Gospel has led several scholars to assume that the Evangelist is attempting to "correct" an erroneous view current in the church of his day which attributed magical powers to the sacramental elements.[3] However, a "correction" motivation applied to the sacraments in the Fourth Gospel stands on even weaker foundations than does the "correction" motivation connected with the supposed transformation of traditional eschatology. Apart from the Fourth Gospel, there is no evidence in the first two centuries of church history of any polemic directed toward the misuse of the sacraments.[4] Those who suppose a Johannine polemic against the improper use of the sacraments (particularly German Lutheran New Testament scholars) are unwittingly

[1] Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 158, thinks that John 6:14f. also constitutes a protest against the old eschatology; in this judgment he is certainly wrong. C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 416, claims that there is a kind of polemic against the idea of the parousia as a cosmic event in that Christ is manifest to his own, but not to the world (cf. John 14:22), and once he has left the world to go to the Father the world will see no more of him (cf. John 14:19). These points are telling only if there is no affirmation of the traditional Parousia in John 14-16. In our opinion there is such an affirmation; cf. the discussion *infra*, pp. 167ff.

[2] Cf. *infra*, pp. 114-121.

[3] Cf. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, pp. 174-77. Bultmann (and many others) describe the Johannine conception of the eucharist in John 6:51b-58 (a passage attributed to the Ecclesiastical Redactor, cf. *supra*, pp. 50f.)with the Ignatian term φάρμακον ἀθανασιας (Ign. Eph. 20:2), thereby revealing a misunderstanding of both John and Ignatius (cf. *infra*, p. 147, n. 4.).

[4] Cf. Robert M. Grant, "Gnostic and Christian Worship," *After the* New Testament (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), pp. 173-82. Baptism and the eucharist were not rejected even by the various Gnostic sects. The only possible evidence for the rejection of the eucharist is to be found in Ignatius' polemic against his docetic opponents (e.g., Smyrn. 7:1). Yet here the issue is not the magical benefits of the sacrament, but its confessional relationship to the historicity of Jesus. It may well be, however, that these opponents abstained from "orthodox" worship in order to use the sacraments for their own purposes and to fill them with a quite different meaning.

projecting on the first two Christian centuries a sacramental theology which is post-Augustinian at best, and post-Tridentine at worst. Although Bultmann and his *Schüler* are particularly guilty of an unnatural polarization of the "Word" and the sacraments, such a polarization has had a long history rooted in the idealism of the "liberal" theology of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[1]

3. The dominant place occupied by realized eschatology within the Gospel of John has also been attributed to a reforming effort on the part of the Evangelist. Either he has attempted to strip away the apocalyptic veneer from the genuine eschatological emphases of the historical Jesus (E. Stauffer),[2] or he has attempted to recapture an original emphasis in the eschatological message of Jesus (C. H. Dodd,[3] J. A. T. Robinson,[4] J. L. McKenzie [5]).[6] The weakness of this position lies, not in its attempt to trace a variety of realized eschatology back to the historical Jesus (for we have seen that such an element was certainly to be found in Jesus' eschatological proclamation),[7] but rather in the claim that this was the explicit intention of the Fourth Evangelist. Positive evidence for viewing the Evangelist as reformer in this sense is not to be found.

4. Yet another proposed motivation for the Johannine transformation of apocalyptic eschatology is, in the language of liberal theology, the intention to reinterpret the meaning of the revelation of Christ from "crude outward fact" to the world of inner religious

---

[1] Cf. *supra*, pp. 17f. Adolf von Harnack, in his famous monograph on Marcion, unnaturally separates his discussion of Marcionite sacramentalism from the discussion of the Marcionite view on the appropriation of salvation by faith (cf. *infra*, pp. 200f.).

[2] Ethelbert Stauffer, "Agnostos Christos: Joh. ii. 24 und die Eschatologie des vierten Evangeliums," *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954), pp. 281-99.

[3] Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, p. 447.

[4] J. A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming: The Emergence of a Doctrine* (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1957), p. 162.

[5] J. L. McKenzie, *The Power and the Wisdom: An Interpretation of the New Testament* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1965), pp. 63f.

[6] Helmut Koester has made an analogous hypothesis with respect to the Gospel of Thomas in an article entitled "One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels," *Harvard Theological Review*, LXI (1968), 203-47, in which he says that the eschatology of the Kingdom in Thomas may not be the Gnostic spiritualization of early Christian apocalyptic, but an interpretation and elaboration of Jesus' most original proclamation (p. 217).

[7] *Supra*, pp. 3ff.

experience.[1] British scholars frequently refer to the transformation of older categories and conceptual images of Jewish apocalyptic to "mysticism," [2] while Ernst Käsemann expresses essentially the same idea when he speaks of the reduction of eschatology from the realm of cosmology to the realm of anthropology.[3] While the older liberal repugnance toward eschatology has largely been overcome, it would seem that their emphasis on religious experience has been functionally replaced by existentialism in Bultmann and his followers.[4]

"Mysticism" is an unfortunate way of describing the realized eschatology of the Fourth Gospel,[5] in that mysticism refers almost exclusively to the religious experience of the individual, and can only with difficulty be reconciled with the presence of *both* temporal and spatial dualism in the framework of Johannine eschatology.[6] To speak of a "Kultmystik" or a "Gemeindemystik", as does Wilhelm Bousset,[7] seems to be almost a contradiction in terms. A variation on this theme is found in the article by C. F. D. Moule, "The Individualism of the Fourth Gospel," in which the author attempts to substantiate the position that future eschatology within the Fourth Gospel is corporately oriented, while realized eschatology concerns only the individual believer. The existence of realized eschatology within the Gospel, according to Moule, is to be attributed to the Evangelist's emphasis on individualism,[8]

[1] Scott, "The New Testament Idea of the Future Life," p. 324; *idem*, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 8; Bacon, *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, pp. 162ff.

[2] Cf. Howard, *Christianity According to St. John*, pp. 109ff.; Barrett, "Unsolved Problems," p. 303.

[3] Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus*, p. 13.

[4] This would seem to be the implication of the remark of Bultmann in an article entitled "A Reply to the Theses of J. Schniewind," *Kerygma and Myth*, ed. Hans Werner Bartsch, trans. Reginald H. Fuller (Harper Torchbooks; New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1961), p. 106: "The only true interpretation of eschatology is one which makes it a real experience of human life."

[5] *Nota bene* the hesitation of Dodd, *Interpretation*, pp. 7, 197-200.

[6] Van Hartingsveld, *Die Eschatologie*, p. 25: "So gibt es im Joh. Evang. eine Horizontale der Zeit und eine Vertikale des Raumes." Essentially, the same affirmation is made by Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, cxvi, and Howard, *Christianity According to St. John*, p. 109; cf. Ricca, *Die Eschatologie*, pp. 141f.

[7] Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, p. 107 (*et passim*).

[8] C. F. D. Moule, "The Individualism of the Fourth Gospel," *Novum Testamentum*, V (1962), 172: "My thesis is that the Fourth Gospel is one of the most strongly individualistic of all the New Testament writings, and that the 'realized eschatology' which is so familiar a feature of this Gospel is the result rather of this individualism than of anything more profound or radical in its thought."

and therefore does not replace futuristic eschatology, but is rather its correlative.[1] The weakness of this position is not only that it resurrects the old views on Johannine "mysticism" and gives them a new respectability, but also that it neither accounts satisfactorily for the Johannine emphasis on "individualism" or "realized" eschatology. Moule's claim that collective allusions are always connected to future eschatological statements is clearly contradicted by such passages as John 6:39, 40, 44 and 54, in which present decision is correlated with future eschatological status.[2]

5. A final motivation for the transformation of apocalyptic eschatology by the Fourth Evangelist is that proposed by Rudolf Bultmann. Closely related to his emphasis on the Fourth Evangelist's corrective measures directed against current eschatological views is his proposal that the Evangelist himself has consciously demythologized the older eschatology. In his reconstruction of eschatological development within the early church, Bultmann is convinced that his own modern program of demythologization is legitimated by the fact that the process of demythologization began quite early with Paul, and was radically implemented by the Fourth Evangelist.[3] This position, of course, presupposes that all statements reflecting apocalyptic eschatology have been inserted into the Gospel by a later editor or redactor.[4] While Bultmann is concerned to deny that the Fourth Evangelist reduces eschatology to mysticism,[5] emphasizing the believing commitment of the individual to a historical fact and a historical person, it can be doubted whether the elimination of both the communal orientation of faith together with its future temporal consummation does justice to the Johannine conception of eschatology.

If all of these attempts to find various motivations within the intention of the Fourth Evangelist for a supposed transformation of the Judaeo-Christian apocalyptic eschatology are judged inadequate and unsuccessful, what factor or factors can be adduced to account for the emphatic dominance of realized eschatology within the theology of the Fourth Gospel?

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 174.

[2] For a lengthy consideration of the way in which the Evangelist formally correlates present and future, cf. *infra*, pp. 109-113.

[3] *Supra*, p. 56, n. 9.

[4] *Supra*, pp. 49-51.

[5] Bultmann, "*Zōē*, etc.," p. 871.

First of all, it must be recognized that the Fourth Evangelist cannot be regarded without further qualification as the "creative genius" and "brilliant theologian" that he is frequently assumed to be.[1] It is more than likely that the Fourth Evangelist not only drew an indeterminate amount of traditional material in both oral and written form from the "reservoir" (C. H. Dodd's term) of tradition which bears some relationship to that preserved in the synoptic gospels, but also that this traditional material had received its "Johannine stamp" long before (the chronology is relative) the first edition of the Gospel saw the light of day.[2] The essential elements of the theology of the Fourth Gospel generally, and the eschatology of the Gospel in particular, were developed within the context of the worship, preaching and teaching of what we may ambiguously designate as the "Johannine community."[3] The "theology" of the Fourth Gospel is not the product of the sophisticated theological reflection of a creative and brilliant reformer, but rather is the forthright expression of the piety or

---

[1] This view finds characteristic expression by B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954), I, ix.

[2] This assertion is made probable not only by the existence of the so-called "Johannine logion" in Matt. 11:25-30, but also by recent theories of the composition of the Fourth Gospel such as that of Father Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, pp. xxxiv-xxxix, in which he posits as a second stage in the development of the Fourth Gospel the formation of a stream of tradition into "Johannine patterns." The initial composition of the gospel begins with a third stage. It is perhaps worth noting that in Eusebius' narration of the composition of the Fourth Gospel (*Hist. eccl.* 3. 24. 7), he notes that before John composed a written gospel he had made use of unwritten preaching.

[3] Krister Stendahl, in discussing the way in which the Fourth Gospel uses the Old Testament, speaks of the "School of St. John" (borrowing the term from A. Fridrichsen, W. Heitmüller and W. Bousset), in which "the Scriptures were studied and meditated upon in the light of the preaching, teaching and debating in which the church was involved" (*The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* [Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup; Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1954], p. 163). Nils Alstrup Dahl believes that his own investigations have confirmed the existence of such a school in his article "The Johannine Church and History," *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*, ed. W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1962), p. 141, n. 26. Whether the term "school" is appropriate is a moot point; the significant element is the distinctiveness of many aspects of Johannine thought and theology which overlap, but are not coextensive with, the theological outlook of other New Testament documents.

spirituality of the Johannine community developed in response to its internal and external situations, experiences, values and beliefs. The distinctive eschatological emphases of the Fourth Gospel are the expression of the traditional beliefs of the Johannine community and not the individualistic *Tendenz* of a creative theologian.[1]

Once we have proposed to view Johannine eschatology as an aspect of Johannine *Gemeindetheologie*, the dominant question becomes that of ascertaining the internal (or ecclesial) characteristics and values and the external (or socio-religious) environment of the Johannine community. Only through the difficult and hypothetical reconstruction of the original communal context of the Fourth Gospel can the real significance of its characteristic eschatology be broached. The assumption behind this statement is that theological expression proceeds from the religious thought and experience of a particular Christian community, and that it is precisely the cult which forms the center of religious life.[2] Therefore, it is not the fact of realized eschatology within the Fourth Gospel which needs intensive investigation (that has certainly been done), nor is it the variety of expression and contexts in which this peculiar variety of eschatology is stated that requires diligent research.[3] Rather, it is precisely the *function* which this type of eschatology had within the Johannine community, its *meaning* to members of that community in relation to their religious experiences and values, and its *mode of realization* which needs investigation and clarification. These kinds of questions cannot be answered apart from a knowledge of the *Sitz im Leben der johanneischen Theologie.*

[1] This emphasis on *Gemeindetheologie* does not deny the religiously motivated modifications of received tradition achieved by the Fourth Evangelist; it is only to stress the community origin of major elements of the Fourth Gospel which has been largely overlooked or underestimated.

[2] One significant example of the importance of the cult in the development of early Christian theology is the hymnic setting for most of the early affirmations of the divinity of Jesus (cf. John 1:1-18; Col. 1:15-20; Phil. 2:6-11; I Tim. 3:16; Rom. 9:5; Heb. 1:8; II Pet. 1:1). Cf. Brown's comments in *The Gospel According to John*, pp. 20-21, 24-25.

[3] Certainly the exegetical and interpretive difficulties presented by the eschatological passages of the Fourth Gospel cannot be ignored. The careful exegesis of van Hartingsveld, for example, certainly deserves full and careful consideration. In spite of the erroneous presuppositions of his interpretive work, many of van Hartingsveld's results are quite compelling. The point to be made here, however, is that the task of exegesis alone, as necessary and as indispensable as it is, must proceed on the basis of the original life situation out of which the various sayings and statements arose.

The Communal Setting and Socio-Religious Environment out of Which the Fourth Gospel Arose

On the basis of both terminological and conceptual similarities, the Fourth Gospel, the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch and the Odes of Solomon are frequently considered to reflect a common historical and religious background within the context of early Christianity.[1] From the side of Judaism, the remarkable linguistic and conceptual parallels offered by the Dead Sea Scrolls has necessitated the inclusion of the Qumran community in this typological group.[2] One of the striking common denominators of this typological grouping of interrelated texts is a strong component of, or affinity for, "Gnosis." Many scholars have thought that the Dead Sea Scrolls give evidence for the existence of a Jewish gnosis antedating the development of Christian Gnosticism. Certainly the existence of an emphasis on realized eschatology within the Qumran community anchored within a cultic and communal setting, makes it all the more probable that here we have an extremely important body of literature which may significantly illumine our understanding of the realized eschatology of the Fourth Gospel.

In contrast to C. H. Dodd, who sees rabbinic Judaism, Philo and the Hermetica as direct sources for understanding the background of the Fourth Gospel,[3] we must, with Paolo Ricca[4] and others,

---

[1] *Supra*, pp. 23-28.

[2] *Supra*, pp. 29-44.

[3] Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 133.

[4] Ricca, *Die Eschatologie*, p. 20. In a moderately lengthy section of Ricca's monograph (pp. 9-30), he discusses "Das religionsgeschichtliche und das theologische Problem des 4. Evangeliums." In dependence on his teacher Oscar Cullmann, Ricca affirms the antiquity of the Johannine type of Christianity together with its dependence on the non-conformist heterodox Judaism of the time (p. 19). "Es ist in der Tat kaum zu bezweifeln," asserts Ricca, "dass das 4. Ev einer ideologischen und geistigen Atmosphäre angehört, die derjenigen der neuen Texte [von Qumran] verwandt ist" (p. 13). Ricca not only sees the significance of the apocalyptic orientation of the Qumran community (i.e., eschatological beliefs held in common with their Jewish contemporaries), but also their unique eschatological emphasis: "Auf der anderen Seite unterscheidet sich die Eschatologie von Qumran von derjenigen des zeitgenössischen Judentums wenigstens in dem Sinn, dass in Qumran die apokalyptische und historische Ebene sich zu nähern streben. Das geschieht auf zwei Arten: einerseits haben die eschatologischen Figuren eine gewisse historische Konkretheit; andererseits ist die Gemeinde selbst *die* eschatologische Gemeinde, ihr Dasein ist an sich ein eschatologisches Geschehen, ihr Leben ist genährt von Eschatologie. Das heisst, in Qumran haftet die Eschatologie schon an der Geschichte" (pp. 15-16).

affirm heterodox Judaism to be the most appropriate background against which the Fourth Gospel must be understood. In the heterodox Judaism represented in the literature from Qumran, it is apparent that elements characteristic of both apocalyptic and incipient gnosis could co-exist without apparent contradiction. Since it is probable that a major segment of the Johannine community came out of this kind of Judaism, this same variety of Judaism posed one of the major threats to the values and beliefs of the community. Externally considered, the Gospel arose within a context of debate with these Jews. Their great threat to the community lay in the fact that so many of their presuppositions and tendencies were held in common.

The Origin of the Form and Content of the Johannine Discourses

The unique character of the Fourth Gospel together with the constellation of textual, literary, historical and theological factors which comprise the Johannine problem have engaged the labors of a vast number of New Testament scholars. Areas of wide-spread agreement in the solution of these problems has unfortunately been limited to relatively insignificant questions. The consistent style together with the careful structural development of the Gospel have reduced source criticism to tears,[1] and left form criticism whimpering on the doorstep.[2] Although the historicity of

Gnostic and mystic tendencies are to be found, according to Ricca, in the literature of Qumran side-by-side and in non-contradiction to the apocalyptic stream of thought (p. 20). It is therefore not on the basis of their common Old Testament background that John is linked with Qumran, but precisely because of their common "gnostischen Färbung" (p. 18). Cf. E. Schweizer, "*Pneuma*, etc.," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, VI, 438: ". . . Jn. thinks more in the categories of a heterodox Judaism than in those of Rabbinism."

[1] But now see Robert T. Fortna, *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, No. 11; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

[2] According to Joachim Rohde, *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelist*, trans. Dorothea M. Barton (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968), p. 8: "It is only in the case of the Gospel of John that the form-critical method is not applicable to the same extent as to the other New Testament writings. No method has yet been found, in view of its peculiar nature, which could be applied to the Gospel of John in the same way as form criticism." Although Martin Dibelius attempted to apply form criticism to the Fourth Gospel in his book *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n. d.), the results were not completely successful. He classified John 1:45-51 and 4:1-42 as legends

aspects of the Johannine tradition has been more favorably judged in recent years,[1] it must be recognized that insurmountable difficulties lie in the way of a favorable assessment of the historical reminiscences within the Fourth Gospel.[2] If the modern (albeit radical) conclusion of synoptic research is that "there is no single pericope anywhere in the gospels, the present purpose of which is to preserve a historical reminiscence of the earthly Jesus," [3] how much more does the same conclusion hold for the Fourth Gospel! While there is not complete discontinuity between the historical Jesus—the subject, after all, of four canonical gospels—and his depiction in the synoptic gospels or even the Fourth Gospel. Form criticism and redaction criticism have made it clear, though, that the post-Easter community has radically reshaped and reformulated the Jesuanic traditions in concert with its own needs and perspectives. Presum-

(pp. 117f.), and theorized that the miracle stories of John 2:1ff.; 4:46ff.; 5:1ff.; 9:1ff.; 11:1ff. had originally circulated as tales (p. 72). Dibelius describes John as working with initiative and in a literary manner, in contrast with the other gospels which are essentially anonymous community productions (p. 90). Before advocating his own method of *Themageschichte*, Siegfried Schulz observes that the form critical investigation of the Gospel of John has led researchers into a *cul de sac* (*Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Methodengeschichte der Auslegung des 4. Evangeliums* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957], pp. 75f.).

[1] This trend has been noted by Reginald Fuller in his book, *The New Testament in Current Study* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), pp. 113ff., 129ff., and is exemplified by the following students of the Fourth Gospel: Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*; *idem*, "The Portrait of Jesus in John and in the Synoptics," *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*, ed. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule and R. R. Niebuhr (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967); A. J. B. Higgins, *The Historicity of the Fourth Gospel* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1960); W. F. Albright, "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of John," *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954). For other works with this emphasis, consult Malatesta, *St. John's Gospel*, pp. 43ff.

[2] The claim for historicity is generally limited to narrative sequence and topography; the task of finding genuine Jesuanic traditions in the discourse material is an arduous one, and one for which the appropriate methodological tools are currently non-existent.

[3] Norman Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967), p. 16. Cf. K. Kundsin, *Typologische Überlieferungsstoffe im Johannes-Evangelium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925), p. 6: "Die Sturm- und Drangzeit des jungen Christentums hatte, bei ihrer enthusiastischen Grundstimmung und bei ihrer Einstellung auf die nahe Parusie des Menschensohnes, kein Interesse für die Festhaltung chronologischer und topographischer Einzelheiten des irdischen Lebens Jesu."

ably this process has been carried out to an even greater degree and in a more distinctive manner in the reshaping and adaptation of the Jesuanic traditions which apparently lie behind the narratives and discourses of the Fourth Gospel. Since the theology of the Johannine community has impressed itself to a much greater degree in the discourses than in the narrative material of the Gospel, it will be the discourses which will be the focus of the ensuing discussion.

While it is not an impossibility that the historical Jesus occasionally addressed his followers with longer discourses than those found in the synoptic tradition, the unique style, vocabulary and theological sophistication reflected in the monologues and dialogues of the Johannine Jesus reveal that the historical Jesus is not their major source. More probably, the Johannine discourses owe their origin to the collection and interpretative elaboration of Jesuanic sayings of varying length derived from a reservoir of tradition by the Johannine community. B. W. Bacon made a penetrating observation regarding the discourse material of the Fourth Gospel when he used the category of "Jewish midrash" to account for the imaginative Johannine reconstructions of synoptic tradition:

> If it be asked how a Christian teacher [i.e., the "Ephesian Elder," according to Bacon] could venture so freely to compose dialogues and monologues supposedly pronounced by Jesus, we ask in turn, how synagogue teachers could venture to propound to their disciples and to other devout hearers dialogues and monologues supposedly uttered by Jevovah through human or angelic interlocutors.[1]

The significance of Bacon's observation takes on new dimensions as a result of the recent form critical investigation of the Fourth Gospel by Peder Borgen. Not only has Borgen demonstrated the feasibility of form critical analysis of certain sections of the Fourth Gospel, but he has also demonstrated that specific sections of the sixth chapter of John conform to the fairly rigid oral and literary form of the midrashic homily.[2] His treatment of John 6:51b-58

---

[1] Bacon, *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, p. 189.

[2] Borgen, *Bread from Heaven*, pp. 28-98. Borgens' study is controlled (and thereby validated) by the careful use of Philonic parallels. The expansion through the use of midrashic methods of other presumed sayings of Jesus may not be as susceptible to such controlled investigation, but may nevertheless be assumed by analogy.

as an integral element of its Johannine context makes it highly unlikely that the passage is an interpolation by a later redactor.[1] Investigations of this type are opening up new vistas in Johannine research, and hold the promise of some spectacular results.

If we assume that many of the discourses of the Johannine Jesus are in fact the end result of a long process of midrashic interpretation and elaboration, there are a number of correlative factors which must be considered. Since midrashic exegesis generally took its point of departure from the sacred texts of the Jewish Scriptures, the fact that the words of Jesus are treated in this manner would seem to imply that they are regarded as equal in value to the words of the Old Testament. This, in point of fact, is precisely what we find in the Fourth Gospel.

The words of Jesus are essentially "canonized" by the application of the typical Johannine fulfilment formula to them in John 18:9 (quoting John 17:12), and John 18:32 (quoting John 12:32f.).[2] In this light, it is not surprising that John used the words of Jesus in as creative and interpretive a way as he did the words of the Old Testament.[3]

In considering the degree of freedom which the author (or authors) of the Johannine discourses assumed in their treatment of

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 25f. Against this aspect of Borgen's thesis see Georg Richter, "Zur Formgeschichte und literarischen Einheit von Joh. 6:31-58," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LX (1969), 21-55.

[2] Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: S. C. M. Press, 1961), p. 270; Freed, *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XI; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), pp. 119f., 123; Wayne Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XIV; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), p. 289. Bultmann views both John 18:9 and 18:32 as additions by the Ecclesiastical Redactor (*Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 495).

[3] Cf. the important conclusions of Freed, *Old Testament Quotations*, p. 129: "Finally, it may be said that when Jn was quoting a passage of Old Testament scripture, he was bound by no rule or fixed text, testimony or other. In every instance his quoted text appears to be adapted to its immediate context, to his literary style, and to the whole plan of the composition of his gospel. Theological motives and ideas were his primary concern. John was only secondarily concerned with the actual quotation as such. The evidence from this study lends weight to the view that the gospel of Jn is primarily a theological and literary composition rather than a historical document." On this basis, Freed—using essentially the same method as C. Maurer in the case of Ignatius' use of the Fourth Gospel (cf. *infra*, p. 137)—is able to make a case for John's knowledge and use of the synoptic gospels (*Ibid.*, p. 130).

traditional Jesuanic material, we are not left to mere conjecture. The Gospel of John contains an explicit rationale for its own existence, a rationale which provides us with some insight into the way in which the words of Jesus were regarded in the Johannine community.[1] One of the passages in which the rationale for the existence of the Fourth Gospel is explicitated is the Paraclete saying in John 14:25f.:

> These things I have spoken to you while remaining with you,
> but the Advocate (that is, the Holy Spirit) whom the Father will send in my name,
> He will teach you all things,
> and will enable you to remember what I have said to you.

Another Paraclete saying of similar import is found in John 16:12-15:

> I still have a great many things to tell you,
> but you are unable to bear them now.
> But when the Spirit of truth comes
> he will guide you into the fulness of truth,
> For he shall not speak on his own authority,
> but he shall declare whatever he hears,
> And he will announce to you the coming events
>
> He will glorify me,
> for he will take of mine and declare it to you.
> All that the Father has is mine,
> therefore I said to you 'He will take of mine and declare it to you.'

These passages enable us to penetrate at least to some degree the intentions of the Fourth Evangelist. It should first of all be noted that the Johannine community regards the words of Jesus as being enigmatical and very difficult to understand.[2] Secondly, the words of Jesus are uttered on the authority of God, and can only be disregarded with the gravest of consequences (John 12:47-50; 5:30-32; 7:16-18; 8:14-16, 38, 40). Since Jesus' words are indeed the words of God (3:34; 5:19), they stand together with the words

[1] The author of the First Letter of John frequently refers to the pneumatic insight which renders rational knowledge unnecessary and makes instruction superfluous (cf. I John 2:20, 27; 4:1-3, 13; 5:7-10, 20).

[2] One of the characteristic stylistic traits of the Fourth Evangelist which bears out this contention is his frequent use of the "motif of misunderstanding" in which the ignorance of an interlocutor gives rise to a question which forms the basis for a lengthy discourse.

of God in the Old Testament as equal in authority and significance (18:9, 32). Consequently, only those who are obedient to the older words of God can be obedient to the new words of God uttered by Jesus (8:46). It is clear also that just as the Old Testament required interpretation, so the words of Jesus also require interpretation (2:22; 13:7; 14:25f.; 16:12-15).[1] It is equally clear from passages within the Farewell Discourses of Jesus that it is precisely the Fourth Gospel which consciously provides just such a pneumatically illumined interpretation of the words of Jesus.[2]

In late Judaism, "prophecy" was little more than pneumatic exegesis of previously given divine oracles. In itself, this was not a new development, but rather continued the practise of the later Old Testament prophets who collected, arranged, supplemented and expanded the oracular utterances of earlier prophets in order to make them relevant to the changing circumstances and needs of historical Israel.[3] In late Judaism, we find the author of the book of Daniel reinterpreting aspects of the prophecy of Jeremiah, and the Teacher of Righteousness of the Qumran community using the gift of the Spirit of God to interpret the eschatological meaning of prophetic writings.[4] Both Jewish and Christian apocalypses show little interest in demonstrating their literary or inspirational independence from the Hebrew scriptures, but rather continue

[1] The Johannine emphasis on the pre-resurrection misunderstanding of Jesus on the part of the disciples is not, of course, unique. The disciples in the Gospel of Mark misunderstand Jesus constantly, while the gospel author knows full well the significance of Jesus' words and deeds.

[2] Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 121: "The Spirit bequeathed by Christ was the abiding possession of His people. They were not dependent on any fixed tradition, but on the living Spirit, which was ever revealing new truth to them, unfolding more and more fully the original revelation of Christ." The truth of Scott's observation should not be obscured by his unsubstantiated polarization of "fixed tradition" versus "new revelation," as if the two were mutually exclusive entities. This erroneous antithesis reflects the old Sohm-Harnack debate which has long since been synthesized by K. Holl, R. Bultmann and others; cf. the short discussion together with a concise bibliography in Conzelmann, *An Outline of the New Testament*, pp. 41f.

[3] Cf. Gerhard von Rad's brilliant account of the way in which the traditions of Israel were preserved and elaborated by successive prophetic figures in *Old Testament Theology*, Vol. II: *The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Traditions*.

[4] Cf. Gert Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, Bd. 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963); Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung*; F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959).

to elaborate and interpret their meaning throughout all the vicissitudes of Jewish history. The authors of the Similitudes of Enoch and IV Ezra independently reinterpreted the Danielic Son of man figure in a manner meaningful to the needs and hopes of their contemporaries. The author of the Apocalypse of John similarly organized a complicated selection of Old Testament allusions, figures and expectations into an organic whole in order to convey a divine word of comfort to the persecuted Christian communities of Asia Minor. It is precisely against such a background that the pneumatic interpretation and elaboration of the words of Jesus expedited by the Johannine community must be viewed. The discourses of the Johannine Jesus have their origin in the pneumatic worship, preaching and teaching of the Johannine community.

Nowhere is this prophetic or revelational quality of the discourses of the Johannine Jesus more evident than in the "I am" sayings.[1] Although there is a degree of phenomenological similarity between the Johannine "I am" sayings and the Gnostic revelation discourses noted by Bultmann and thoroughly investigated by Becker,[2] the similarities are more apparent than real.[3] If the "I am" sayings are regarded as a thoroughly Christian product, then their origin can only be adequately accounted for by considering them the products of Christian prophecy, whereby the risen Lord speaks in the first person singular through inspired Christian prophets within a cultic setting.[4] The "I am" sayings of the Fourth Gospel have

---

[1] For an excellent though concise survey of the background and possible interpretations of the "I am" sayings in John, see Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, pp. 533-38 (Appendix IV).

[2] H. Becker, *Die Reden des Johannesevangeliums und der Stil der gnostischen Offenbarungsrede* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Neue Folge, Heft 50; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956).

[3] In an excellent article entitled "Zur Diskussion über die Ego-Eimi-Sprüche im Johannesevangelium," *Charisteria Joh. Köpp octogenario oblata* (Holmiae, 1954), pp. 95-107, Karl Kundsin discusses Bultmann's theory of the revelation discourses and observes: "Die johanneischen Ich-Aussagen weisen vielmehr einen zwar in vielem *verwandten*, aber in einer Hinsicht durchaus selbständigen, original-christlichen Typus der Ich-Rede auf" (pp. 101-2). Kundsin sees a remarkable similarity between the Johannine "I am" sayings with their distinctive "soteriologischer Nachsatz" (pp. 102-3), and similar sayings in the Apocalypse of John (pp. 105-6).

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 106: ". . . die Ichreden des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse sind *aus einer und derselben Quelle* geflossen, und diese gemeinsame Quelle oder Wurzel sind die Offenbarungsworte *des auferstandenen Christus*." Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh

in our opinion, the same origin, function and significance as do the "I" sayings of the Odes of Solomon, which we shall investigate shortly.[1]

It would therefore be incorrect to claim, with Ernst Käsemann, that basic elements of congregational life, worship, sacraments and the ministry play only insignificant roles in the Fourth Gospel.[2] Such elements do not receive explicit treatment precisely because they are the presuppositions of the ecclesial context out of which the Gospel arose. Since the Fourth Gospel was not written for the consumption of modern scholars, it is necessary for us to break the code in which the Gospel is written, and which it presupposes. No context other than that of the worshipping Johannine community can offer as satisfactory and as appropriate a setting for the pneumatically inspired "I am" sayings.

Delineating a Profile of the Johannine Community

Customarily, when the subject for discussion is the church in the Fourth Gospel, two avenues of approach are used. Either the supposed Johannine imagery for the church is discussed (e.g., the vine and the branches, the good shepherd and the sheep, etc.), or else the supposed Johannine sacramental imagery is explored. While these methods have yielded some results, the lack of scholarly agreement together with the inconsequential nature of much of the resultant data would seem to indicate that these routes are not the most fruitful paths to follow.

If the Fourth Gospel is the end product of the worship and piety of the Johannine community, and if the interpretation and elaboration of the words of Jesus took place within an ecclesial context through the inspiration of the Spirit-Paraclete, how can the characteristics of this community be delineated in order that the original setting in the life of this community for the Fourth Gospel be established? If the character of the Johannine community is primarily depicted through the use of the tools of historical criticism, one runs the risk of producing a mélange of characteristics derived

---

(New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963), p. 163, where he attributes secondary "I" sayings in the synoptic tradition to Christian prophets.

[1] *Infra*, pp. 175f.

[2] Käsemann, *Testament of Jesus*, p. 27.

from the various literary and material sources of first century religious thought which may or may not (one can never know) represent centers of gravity within the thought of the Johannine community itself.[1]

On the other hand, if one relies initially upon literary criticism and analysis for data pursuant to a reconstruction of the values and religious orientation of the Johannine community, and only then links that reconstruction to appropriate and congruent phenomena from the history of religions or other varieties of early Christianity, the resulting reconstruction may not only be more authentically Johannine on the one hand, but may also provide an additional set of criteria for judging the appropriateness of "parallel" religio-theological ideas, concepts and motifs.

One path to the solution of the problem of delineating the character and nature of the Johannine community has been the recognition that in the composition of the Fourth Gospel the author not only had in mind the presentation of traditional material, but was also vitally concerned with the religious significance which that tradition had for the church of his day. From this perspective, then, we have two distinguishable levels which have been blended by the Evangelist into one unified account. The most recent, and by far the most convincing and methodologically sound analysis of the Fourth Gospel from this perspective is the study by J. Louis Martyn entitled *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel.*[2]

Martyn's main concern is what I would prefer to call the determination of the socio-religious environment of the Fourth Gospel, or the particular external circumstances in response to which the

---

[1] One of the great weaknesses of Shirley Jackson Case's instructive book *The Evolution of Early Christianity: A Genetic Study of First-Century Christianity in Relation to Its Religious Environment* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1914), is its lack of specificity. It is only at the end of very long and valuable chapters on the religion and philosophy of the Graeco-Roman world that an attempt is made to relate these intellectual and religious "environments" to early Christian thought. While Case's formulation of the socio-historical method developed in the Chicago School continues to retain validity, the focus of research must certainly be the particular document of the New Testament or early church with which one is particularly concerned. For a more explicit statement of the socio-historical method see Shailer Mathews, "The Historical Study of Religion," *A Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion,* ed. Gerald Birney Smith (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1916), pp. 19-79.

[2] J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968).

Gospel was written. Limiting his investigation primarily to chapters five and seven, nine and ten of the Fourth Gospel, Martyn shows how the original miracle narratives of chapters five and nine have been expanded and adapted to reflect the actual current experiences of the Johannine community, particularly in the matter of exclusion from the synagogues.[1] He isolates three foci which characterized the "dialogue" between the Johannine church and the Jewish synagogue: (1) the technical question of Jesus' messiahship, (2) the correct interpretation of his signs, and (3) the relationship between Jesus and Moses.[2] Although there are other indications that the Jewish opponents of the Johannine community gravitated toward heterodoxy (such as the "ascent polemic" in John 3:13), careful consideration of Martyn's study does reveal the inner values and concerns of the Johannine community which were determined by their external socio-religious environment.

Another path to the solution of the problem of delineating the character of the Johannine community, and one which is more concerned with their own self-understanding, is that which has been presented briefly by Ernst Käsemann in a brief but provocative book, *The Testament of Jesus*. In the same way that the synoptic depiction of the apostles and disciples of Jesus is used by modern scholars to unlock the respective communal organization and interests of the churches which produced those gospels, Käsemann proposes that the stereotyped Johannine use of the term "disciples," while part of the tradition received by John, is thoughtfully and deliberately used to "characterize the nature of the Johannine community at its very core." [3] On this basis, Käsemann comes to some rather far-reaching conclusions:

> If we review our investigation thus far from this aspect, our individual observations can be assembled into a picture. The community which knows itself to be governed by the Spirit can let the apostolate, the ministry and its organization melt into the background and understand itself in the manner of a conventicle which is constituted through its individual members and which designates itself as the circle of friends and brothers. This community may take up and use the oldest self-designations and traditions of primitive Christianity, traditions which at the end of the first century appear outdated and obsolete, and thus come into conflict with de-

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 17ff.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 91.
[3] Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus*, p. 30.

veloping early Catholicism. In short, John stands within an area of tensions in the Church.[1]

The "tensions in the Church" over organizational issues, of course, is an assertion of the external relationship of the Johannine community to other early Christian groups which is totally incapable of demonstration, based as it is on what the Fourth Gospel does not say about the organization of the community in which it arose. The major limitation of Käsemann's approach, however, lies in the fact that the "disciples" alone are not the primary vehicle which the Johannine community has used to express its own self-identity and self-understanding.

The Christology of the Fourth Gospel is the primary means of expressing the religious needs, values and ideals of the Johannine community. That is to say that the Christology of the Johannine community is primarily determined by the soteriological interests of the ecclesiology of that community. The three main elements which have gone into the depiction of the Johannine Jesus include: (1) traditions concerning the historical Jesus which (legendary or not) reflect a community concern with his historicity and actuality,[2] (2) elements of traditional Christologies consisting mainly in the variety of images or modes of conceptualization whereby the revelatory and soteriological significance of Jesus was made religiously meaningful in the past,[3] and (3) the current experience of the living Jesus as the mediator of salvific benefits and the object of cultic worship within the Johannine community.[4] The

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 31-2. For a brief description of the "older" self-designations and traditions of the Palestinian church, cf. Karl Kundsin, "Primitive Christianity in the Light of Gospel Research," *Form Criticism*, ed. and trans. F. C. Grant (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), pp. 96-119.

[2] For Ignatius of Antioch, the actuality of the passion of Jesus was confirmed by his own (present experience) of suffering (Trall. 10:1; Smyrn. 4:2; 5:1), cf. *infra*, p. 140. Here a tradition concerning the historical Jesus is used by Ignatius as a datum which gives meaning to his own experience. In the Fourth Gospel also, historical traditions are retained, either because (1) they still possess some existential or soteriological significance for the community, (2) they are capable of reinterpretation, thereby becoming significant for the community, or else (3) they are formally retained because of religious conservatism, yet are not materially incorporated into current religious beliefs or practises.

[3] In the Fourth Gospel, for example, many traditional Christological titles are retained, but frequently they are drained of their original meaning, and are made functional equivalents of each other.

[4] The absense of the title kyrios (in the sense of the exalted Lord of the Church) from the Fourth Gospel cannot be attributed to the cultic

significant elements of this cultically-oriented experience were determined by the redemptive and experiential needs of the Johannine community; the conception of Jesus which developed was directly related to, and a projection of, those needs.[1]

Viewed from the perspective of these presuppositions, the Johannine Jesus becomes comprehensible as a projection (or retrojection) of the religious needs and experiences of the Johannine community in combination with other more traditional historical and conceptual factors. In this light, the results of Martyn's investigation become immensely significant: the reason for the historical setting for this way of telling the story of Jesus becomes clear. The actual experience of the Johannine community is grounded on the actuality of the historical experience of Jesus; the reality of the former is a vindication of the reality of the latter.

---

and sacramental reservations of the author (contra Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, II, 36), since the exalted Son of man occupies an equivalent functional position within the cultus of the Johannine community. The weakness of Bousset's kyrios-cult hypothesis becomes clear, since the theory of a transition from a Palestinian Son of man Christology to a Hellenistic kyrios Christology fails to take the evidence found in the Fourth Gospel seriously. Cf. Bousset's statement of this transition in *Kyrios Christos*, p. 125: "Der Menschensohn wird so ziemlich vergessen werden und als eine unverstandene Hieroglyphe in den Evangelien stehen bleiben, dem im Kulte gegenwärtigen Kyrios gehört die Zukünft." Evidence from the Fourth Gospel supports the theory that the cultic worship of the exalted Jesus began in early Palestinian Christianity; cf. Deissmann, *Paul*, pp. 113, 125, n. 2.

[1] Rudolf Schnackenburg, in *The Church in the New Testament*, trans. W. J. O'Hara (New York: Herder & Herder, 1965), p. 104, briefly mentions this aspect of Johannine ecclesiology, but fails to develop it further: "The impelling motive for the composition of this late gospel (the traditions of which it is true must go back very far) certainly lies in the author's intention to provide the Church of his time and surroundings with *a picture of Christ corresponding to the Church's spiritual condition*, but which, in the evangelist's view was already perceptible in Jesus' words and work (cf. 1:17f., 17:3; 20:31)." This insight is found more fully developed in the various discussions of Christology by John Knox (a short bibliography of his works on this subject may be found on p. ix, n. 1 of his book *The Humanity and Divinity of Christ* [Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1967]). On p. 3 of this book Knox observes: "The phrase 'Jesus Christ our Lord' designates, not primarily an historical individual in the past, not yet a character in a symbolic story, but a present reality actually experienced within the common life." Cf. Mathews, "The Historical Study of Religion," p. 46: "Theology deals primarily with experience, and experience is far more extensive than rational processes. Theology arises when men undertake to organize their inherited and new religious experiences, beliefs, and customs in harmony with other elements of experience, and thus to satisfy their deepest spiritual need for unity between their faith and their knowledge of the universe."

The basic rationale for this principle of the communal and individual *imitatio Christi* [1] in the religious thought of the Johannine community is probably the conception of the final unity of believers in eternity with Jesus (cf. John 17:21, 23f.).[2] This final eschatological unity is proleptically realized and experienced within the life of the community as they corporately and individually conform their lives to the experience of Jesus. Because of the conviction of the Johannine community that in a very real sense Jesus is "The Way" to the Father (and to eschatological unity with the same), the community not only held that through belief and participation in Jesus men have access to the Father, but primarily in the sense that the life of Jesus is a paradigm of the proper experience of each individual Christian.[3] In order to substantiate the hypothesis that the Christology of the Fourth Gospel embodies the salvific needs of the Johannine community, we shall proceed to consider carefully the Johannine characterization of the life and ministry of Jesus as it is explicitly correlated by the Evangelist to the experience of the followers or disciples of Jesus, i.e., the Johannine community.

Once we begin to approach the Fourth Gospel from this perspective, an amazing correlation begins to take shape: the character and function of Jesus is identical with the character and function of the followers of Jesus.[4] This dynamic relationship between Jesus and the Johannine community can be logically and systematically unfolded through the consideration of the explicit statements provided by the Evangelist.

In John 13:15f. and 15:20, we find an affirmation of the master-servant relationship which obtains between Jesus and his disciples. In chapter thirteen, the logic and reality of this relationship dictates the conclusion that the disciples of Jesus ought to emulate the action of their lord by washing the feet of others. In 15:20, which

---

[1] Cf. the Jewish idea that the observance of the Law as an *imitatio Dei* (Davies, "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," p. 121). On the *imitatio Dei* see further I. Abrahams, *Pharisaism and the Gospels*, Second Series (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1967), pp. 138-182.

[2] On the supposed Gnostic origin of this type of salvific imagery see Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus*, pp. 56-73.

[3] The only exception to this statement is the necessary depiction by the Fourth Evangelist of the unique sonship of Jesus.

[4] While this correlation between Jesus and his followers is emphasized to an extraordinary degree in the Fourth Gospel, it is also to be found in the synoptic gospels as well.

explicitly alludes to 13:16, this principle is enlarged to include the implication that if Jesus was persecuted, then his followers will also encounter persecution; if the message of Jesus was not believed, then the message of his disciples would similarly not be believed. It is clear that the proverb, "a servant is not greater than this master" is being used by the Fourth Evangelist to affirm that the experience of the followers of Jesus will be a carbon copy of the experience of Jesus. The nomenclature of this maxim is later modified in view of the more profound relationship implied by the mutual "friendship" of Jesus and his followers (15:14-15). The second proverb found in John 13:16 ("nor is he who is sent greater than he who sent him") is parallel to the master-servant proverb, and expresses essentially the same insight of the Evangelist in a different way. This proverb is elaborated in 13:20 by relating it to the mission of Jesus as one sent by the Father, a mission which is continued through the commissioning of the disciples by Jesus. We know that this verse is significant for the theology of the Fourth Evangelist precisely because (apart from its elaboration in 13:16b), it is essentially unrelated to its context. Thus the significance of this Johannine use of a proverbial logion of Jesus (also found in Matt. 10:24f. and Lk. 6:40),[1] is that the Fourth Evangelist is thereby provided with a rationale stamped with the authority of Jesus himself for his belief in the salvific necessity of the *imitatio Christi.*

We find, therefore, that an extremely wide range of ideas is located within the contexts of the two passages under consideration, John 13:16 and 15:20. The connection between these two passages is not conjectural since the Evangelist himself makes the cross reference explicit in 15:20. The range of ideas to this point includes the following characteristics of Jesus, which also obtain for his followers: (1) Jesus' act of humility in washing the feet of the disciples must be imitated by his disciples in that they are to wash one another's feet, (2) Jesus' experience of persecution will be reduplicated in the experience of his disciples, (3) the unbelief with which the message of Jesus was received will characterize the reception which the disciples of Jesus will proclaim, and (4)

[1] Cf. Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition,* pp. 86, 99, 168. It is not without significance that both proverbs found in John 13:16 (v. 16b is repeated in v. 20, and v. 16a in 15:20), are to be found within the same context in the tenth chapter of the gospel of Matthew. Matt. 10:40f. contains the proverb which deals with the sender and the one sent.

the divine authority with which Jesus was imbued as an emissary of God (thereby validating the message, and making it absolutely imperative that the message be accepted as valid and believed), is transferred to the disciples of Jesus so that their message bears the same stamp of divine approval as did that of Jesus.

Each of these points, with the exception of the first, is repeated and re-emphasized throughout the Fourth Gospel, thereby underlining the significance which they undoubtedly had for the theology of the Johannine community. The worldly hostility which the disciples will encounter is consequent upon their belief in Jesus together with their "rebirth from above" (John 3:3, 7), for they are then no longer "of this world" (15:19; 17:14), just as Jesus is "not of this world" (8:23; 17:14). The followers of Jesus will be hated (15:18; 17:14), persecuted (15:20; 16:1-2, 33), and even murdered (15:13; 16:2).[1] Each of these expressions of worldly hostility was a factor in the experience of Jesus, and on that basis will also be factors in the wordly experience of the followers of Jesus.

The mission of the disciples, which in reality is a continuation of the mission of Jesus under different circumstances, stands over against the world of unbelief with the same significance as did the historic mission of Jesus.[2] Within the framework of the Fourth Gospel, the execution of Jesus' mission is in terms of his words and works. Jesus conveyed the words of God to the disciples, and the response was one of acceptance and belief (17:8). It is this message of Jesus, which in reality is the message of God, that the disciples will proclaim in ever new and changing circumstances. Nevertheless this word will find the same response of unbelief that met the word of Jesus (15:20). These words will be pneumatically recalled to the minds of the disciples, and will be further interpreted and elaborated through the agency of the Spirit-Paraclete (16:12-15).

---

[1] Cf. Karl Kundsin, "Die Wiederkunft Jesu in den Abschiedsreden des Joh. Evgls.," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXXIII (1934), 210-15. Although Kundsin is certainly wrong in maintaining that the "coming" of Jesus in the Farewell Discourses is his coming at the instance of the martyr-deaths of his followers, his observation on p. 212 that the martyrdom of Jesus implies the martyrdom of the disciples has a great deal of merit viewed from the perspective of our presentation. There is only a short step from this Johannine view to the theology of martyrdom found in the Letters of Ignatius.

[2] Cf. James McPolin, "Mission in the Fourth Gospel," *Irish Theological Quarterly*, XXXVI (1969), 113-22.

With respect to the works of Jesus, an even more surprising affirmation is contained in John 14:12: "Truly, truly, I say to you, he who believes in me will also do the works that I do; and greater works than these will he do, because I go to the Father." In this light, the two foci of the Fourth Gospel (the traditional material relating to the mission and message of Jesus, and the current application of that material in the light of contemporary religious experience), takes on greater significance. The miraculous signs which Jesus performed are not related simply out of historical interest or curiosity, but rather because the Johannine community itself was a charismatic community in which the miraculous activity of the risen Lord through the agency of the Spirit-Paraclete was being made manifest.[1] The miraculous activity which characterized the ministry of Paul (Gal. 3:3, 5; II Cor. 12:11-13; Rom. 15:18-19), and the communities which he founded (I Cor. 12:9f., 28; Gal. 3:5), and which characterized the early years of the church as recorded in the Book of Acts, is also an important element in the experience of the Johannine community.

The divine commission which Jesus received from his Father, together with the divine anointment with which his ministry was initiated (John 1:32-34), are the two factors which enable the Johannine Jesus to speak and act in the stead of God himself.[2] The Johannine emphasis on the place of the Spirit in authenticating the divine word of Jesus (3:34), makes it difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Fourth Gospel does depict Jesus as a pneuma-

[1] Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*, p. 8: "The work of Jesus appears not to be terminated in the time of his earthly life. On the contrary, his going to the Father inaugurates a time in which his followers do his works. Indeed, 9:4a ["we must work the works of him who sent me while it is yet day"; Martyn sees a sharp contradiction between 9:4a and 9:4b-5] leads us to see this continuation of Jesus' works as an activity of the Risen Lord in the deeds of Christian witnesses."

[2] Théo Preiss advocates the use of the term "juridical mysticism" to express the identification of the one sent with the sender, in his article "Justification in Johannine Thought," *Life in Christ*, trans. Harold Knight (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 13; Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1957), pp. 16, 25. Cf. K. H. Rengstorf, "*Apostellō*, etc.," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, I, 400f., 404ff., 443f. Actually, most of the content of that which Preiss wishes to designate "juridical mysticism" may be included within a careful definition of "messiah"; cf. David E. Aune, "The Problem of the Messianic Secret," *Novum Testamentum*, XI (1969), 19: "A *mashiach* may be defined as one who has been called by God and anointed with his Spirit for the task of revealing his will and person and for the performance of certain activities in which the agency of God is evident."

tic.[1] According to the Fourth Gospel, the divine commission of Jesus was transferred to the disciples. This is made clear in John 13:20, an expansion of 13:16b, whose thought is reiterated in 17:18: "As you have sent me into the world, I also have sent them into the world." The mission of the disciples is therefore virtually identical with the mission of Jesus in both purpose and significance. The only factor which the disciples lack is supplied by the bestowal of the Spirit-Paraclete after the glorification of Jesus (20:21b: "As the Father has sent me, even so I send you. And when he had said this he breathed on them and said 'Receive the Holy Spirit'. . .").

Finally, we learn that the "life" of the disciples is dependent on the "life" of Jesus (14:19; I Jn. 4:9; 5:11-12). Although the Johannine Jesus claims to be, or personify, Life (11:25; 14:6), the Fourth Evangelist makes it perfectly clear that this life is derivative from the life of the Father (5:26). Therefore the possession of this eschatological blessing of salvation by believers is only possible because this divine gift of life has been mediated by the Father to Jesus, and through Jesus to the Christian community. The essential ethical dimension of eschatological life is love, which in the Fourth Gospel can only be considered as an eschatological reality. The love of the Father for the Son (3:35, 10:17; 17:23), has been mediated by Jesus to the disciples, who are to express that love in concrete ways within the group (13:34-35; I Jn. 2:10f.; 3:11, 14-24; 4:7-12, 16-21). As the primary mode of expressing realized eschatology within the Fourth Gospel, eternal life has both a communal setting as well as a cultic orientation.

Not only has the gift of life been derived by Jesus from the Father, but also the authority to judge or condemn (John 5:27). If the followers of Jesus possess life by virtue of their relationship to the possessor of life, do they also possess a similar authority to judge or condemn in a final or eschatological sense? While the Fourth Gospel has little to say on this subject, what it does say is decidedly clear. After the reception of the Holy Spirit in the upper room, the disciples were told by Jesus, "If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven; if you retain the sins of any, they are retained" (20:23; cf. Matt. 16:19; 18:18; 28:19; Mk. 16:16, longer ending; Lk. 24:47). As it stands, this logion of Jesus

[1] Schweizer, "*Pneuma*, etc.," p. 438, denies the pneumatic character of Jesus' life as presented in the Fourth Gospel.

must be regarded as an essentially unchanged segment of traditional Jesuanic material received from the reservoir of tradition by the Evangelist. Jesus' ministry of forgiveness of sins, so important in the synoptic gospels, is only of marginal concern in the Fourth Gospel (5:14 is the only significant reference). Nevertheless the inclusion of this logion by the Evangelist is not without its significance for the theology of the Johannine community. Here the forgiveness of sins is undoubtedly to be understood as a consequence of the positive response to the evangelical message of the community, and therefore the occasion for the reception of eternal life. The retention of the sins of others can therefore be understood as the ministry of "judgment" attendant upon the rejection of the words of God as they are mediated in the proclamation of the followers of Jesus. These observations are confirmed by John 16:8, in which Jesus promises that when the Spirit-Paraclete comes, "he will convince the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." Members of the Christian community generally and the Johannine community in particular are the agents of the Spirit-Paraclete, and it is through their proclamation that this ministry of judgment is expedited.[1]

In the discussion to this point, we have attempted to construct a profile of the Johannine community, delineating their religious values, needs and aspirations. We have been particularly concerned with the theological significance which the Johannine portrait of Jesus had for the contemporary concerns of the Christian community in which the Fourth Gospel arose. It can hardly be doubted that the Johannine conception of the corporate and individual life of Christians was radically modelled after the life of Jesus as perceived through the "eyes of faith" of the Johannine community. The significant characteristics of the life and ministry of the

[1] At this point we must disagree with Raymond E. Brown, "The Kerygma of the Gospel According to John," *Interpretation*, XXI (1967), 391: "Yet one cannot simply assume that everything said to the Twelve in John is meant to apply to all Christians. For instance, the power both to absolve and to hold men's sins is explicitly given to (ten of) the Twelve in 20:23 in a post-Resurrection scene where they have just been *sent*. (Matthew, Luke, and the Marcan Appendix all have a solemn post-Resurrection commission of the Eleven by Jesus.) There is no real evidence that such power was given to all Christians. Presumably such a power was still important for the Johannine community, and the memory that it was originally given to the Eleven is significant (although we have no data on how it passed from them to those who now hold it in the Johannine community)."

Johannine Jesus bear such a strikingly close relationship to the features which are to mark the followers of Jesus, that the correlation can hardly be fortuitous. The Johannine Jesus becomes comprehensible when viewed as a projection of the religious needs and values of the Johannine community in combination with a variety of traditional, historical and conceptual factors. We have already made some intimations concerning the cultic setting and communal orientation of the realized eschatology which is so noteworthy a feature of the theology of the Fourth Gospel. Our conclusions concerning the ecclesiological determination of Johannine Christology will have a radical effect on the commonly held view of the Christocentricity of Johannine eschatology.

The Significance of the Christological Orientation of Johannine Eschatology

In recent investigations of Johannine eschatology, the Christocentric character of that eschatology has been underlined again and again. In primitive Christianity, Christology was ordinarily determined by eschatology. In the Fourth Gospel the very opposite is the case; "Christology determines eschatology," according to Käsemann, "and eschatology becomes an aspect of Christology." [1] This approach to Johannine eschatology has been particularly emphasized by Paolo Ricca (*Die Eschatologie des vierten Evangeliums*, 1966), and Josef Blank (*Krisis: Untersuchungen zur johanneischen Christologie und Eschatologie*. 1964).

Ricca stresses the notion that the portrayal of Jesus as the Messiah dominates the entire Fourth Gospel, radically and thoroughly conditioning its eschatology.[2] Unhappy with the usual designations of the peculiar nature of Johannine eschatology which, while not inaccurate in themselves, fail to emphasize the controlling factor of Christology,[3] Ricca suggests the term "personalized eschatology" as a more adequate shorthand description of the eschatology of the Fourth Gospel.[4] Since Ricca includes Pneumatology along with Christology as the context of the problem of Johannine eschatology,[5] he includes both elements in a succint summary of his position:

[1] Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus*, p. 16.
[2] Ricca, *Die Eschatologie des vierten Evangeliums*, p. 82.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 90.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 91.
[5] Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 62.

> Let us summarize: The Gospel of John exhibits a deep theological consciousness of the reality and fullness of the eschatological consummation as it was realized in the history and particularly the person of Jesus. The Johannine eschatology is completely centered and comprehended in the person of the pre-existent, incarnate, crucified, resurrected Christ living in heaven and represented on earth by his *alter ego* the Spirit. We have therefore suggested that Johannine eschatology be termed a "personalized" eschatology. In Jesus the messianic age has come, and all of the messianic realities are offered to man in community with him through faith. The actualization of the eschaton in Jesus is accompanied by the actualization of judgment, glory, truth, knowledge, love, eternal life and many other eschatological realities as well.[1]

As significant as these observations may be concerning the central importance of Christology for the proper understanding of Johannine eschatology, Ricca says nothing with regard to the factors which were at work in the formulation of the Johannine Jesus by the community. Although Ricca agrees with Alf Corell that the church stands in the background of the theology of the Fourth Evangelist,[2] he quickly shifts his focus to the Christological perspective: "We will see that the bearer of salvation history in the Gospel of John is not a 'collective,' not the church, *but only the will of God in Christ.*"[3]

Josef Blank is in essential agreement with Ricca that Christology is crucial for the understanding of the Johannine judgment theology, the phase of Johannine eschatology with which Blank is particularly concerned.[4] In Blank's own words,

> Thus it appears to us that in fact, Christology occupies the central position in the Gospel of John, affecting the doctrine of God, revelation, soteriology, eschatology, anthropology and ecclesiology.[5]

Blank repeats and elaborates this position frequently throughout the remainder of his study:

> The presence of the divine offer of life, the presence of salvation and of judgment is set side by side with the presence of Jesus Christ, and is to be understood from the perspective of this presence of Jesus Christ. That is to say that, as it is now beginning to become clear, the problem of the so-called "realization of eschatolo-

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 128.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 54f.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 57 (Italics mine).
[4] Blank, *Krisis*, p. 15.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 38f.

> gy" is primarily a problem of Christology. The particular conception of eschatology in the Fourth Gospel is conditioned by Christology, and is to be understood as a function of Christology and not the reverse.[1]

While Ricca only marginally touches the significance of the Spirit in interpreting the eschatology of the Fourth Evangelist, Blank gives this factor a much more prominent place:

> The Spirit is therefore "the same" and does "the same" as Christ: he bears witness to the truth which has been revealed by Christ, and in this manner makes the revelation an ever present reality. It could be said that the constant realization of the Christ-event and of the witness of Christ occurs through the Spirit; they are his "work." The Spirit is the basis and reason, the "principle" of the Johannine realized theology.[2]

There are obviously wide areas of agreement between the way in which both Ricca and Blank approach Johannine eschatology. First of all, it is quite clear that eschatology is a function of Christology, and not only *a* function, but *the* function. Secondly, this eschatological function of Christ continues to remain valid, that is to say that it continues to be "realized" eschatology through the agency of the Spirit-Paraclete. Thirdly, (though this point is hardly touched by either Ricca or Blank), the locus of this work of Christ's *alter ego* is the Johannine community. However, neither Ricca nor Blank betray any hint of comprehending the thoroughgoing way in which the soteriological phase of Johannine ecclesiology has radically shaped the Christology of the Johannine community.

The ecclesial orientation of Johannine eschatology advocated by Alf Corell in his book *Consummatum Est: Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of John,* provides a corrective (albeit an inadequate one) to the approach of Ricca and Blank. This in spite of the exegetical weakness, the unwarranted (and inconclusive) "ultra-sacramental" [3] approach to the Gospel which he utilizes, and the patently (Roman Catholic) dogmatic stance with which he approaches the theology of the Fourth Gospel. Following a number

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 124f.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 215.
[3] Cf. Raymond E. Brown, "The Johannine Sacramentary," *New Testament Essays* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1965), pp. 54ff., where he discusses various representatives of what he terms the "ultra-sacramental" view of John.

of Scandinavian scholars who similarly make a close connection between eschatology and church in the Fourth Gospel, Corell quotes W. G. Kümmel with approval:

> If St. John's eschatology is related only to the individual then we are faced with mysticism, not real eschatology. If, however, the Johannine eschatology is rooted in the doctrine of the Church, in her life, her confession and her orders, then being concerned with a community and with the experience of this community, it will be true eschatology.[1]

It is only in the church that faith becomes a possibility, and no one has more emphatically emphasized the "truly Christian" maxim, "extra ecclesiam nulla salus," than the Fourth Evangelist.[2] In a careful summary of his own position, Corell observes,

> The gospel aims at showing how the expectations about the coming Messiah were fulfilled through Jesus Christ in his earthly existence, and how this existence is being fulfilled and perfected through his continuing work as risen Lord in the sacraments of the Church, until the Parousia, when the New Age of the Church ceases, and all promises will come to their final fulfilment. The whole line of thought is thus altogether eschatological. The proleptic eschatology of the Jewish cult is fulfilled in Christ, who in his turn creates in the Church *a new eschatological position, which is experienced in the cult,* and continually points onwards to the end of this age and to the great fulfilment.[3]

If Bultmann and his followers may be charged with polarizing the word and the sacraments in the theology of the Fourth Gospel, and placing a strongly post-Reformation emphasis on the former, Corell must equally be charged with reading post-Tridentine sacramentalism into the thought of the Evangelist. Corell betrays not the slightest idea of the ecclesial function of the Johannine Jesus, nor does he emphasize the significance of pneumatology in the eschatology of the Fourth Gospel. He carries all his theological eggs in a sacramental basket.

To this point we have attempted to delineate a profile of the Johannine community which might serve as a *Sitz im Leben* in which the emphatic Johannine emphasis on realized eschatology might become comprehensible. Beginning with the assumption that while historical reminiscences of the actuality of Jesus together

[1] Corell, *Consummatum Est,* p. 84. The source for this quotation is not given.
[2] *Ibid.,* p. 202.
[3] *Ibid.,* p. 78.

with the traditional Christological modes of conceptualizing the salvific significance of Jesus have played a minor though important role in the formation of the Johannine Jesus, it was primarily the current experience of the living Jesus within the Johannine community which expressed the religious needs, values and ideals of that community which was the major motivational factor in their depiction of Jesus. The very existence of the community was tied to a specific conception of what Jesus was, and this conception bears an unmistakeable mirror image of their own idea of what the life of a Christian ought to be within the church. It is therefore the assumption of the necessity of the *imitatio Christi* which forms the very basis for the possibility of realized eschatology within the Johannine community. The main elements of realized eschatology within the Fourth Gospel—the present possession of eternal life, the phenomenon of judgment as a factor in present experience, and the proleptic experience of the "coming" of Jesus within a cultic setting—all radiate from the pneumatic worship of the Johannine community, centering in the eucharist, and extending to individual and corporate relationships within their socio-religious environment.

Realized eschatology, then, finds an eminently suitable contex- within the internal environment of the worshipping, preaching and teaching Johannine community, all of whose activities must be described as pneumatic, charismatic or prophetic. Ernst Käsemann has made the observation that "it is not at all sufficiently emphasized that John must be seen in the historical and theological context of a Christian prophecy . . ." [1] We have already advanced the hypothesis that the Christology of the Fourth Gospel was largely the projection of the soteriological aspect of ecclesiology, and that the characteristics of the Johannine Jesus are all existentially relevant ideas of the Johannine community. These values and ideals have been discussed at some length. However, if we are to use a single category with which to categorize the Johannine Jesus, it would probably have to be that of "prophet." [2] This is

[1] Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus*, p. 38.

[2] The best exegetical reason for describing Jesus as a "prophet" is the use of imagery drawn from the late Jewish expectation of a new Moses which permeates the Fourth Gospel (cf. Meeks, *Prophet and King*). Ferdinand Hahn believes that the synoptic emphasis on signs and miracles in connection with the messiah indicates an expectation based on the eschatological Mosaic prophet, not expectations surrounding the Davidic messiah (*Christologische Hoheitstitel* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963], p. 219).

primarily because the Johannine Jesus is depicted as the plenipotentiary who brings the new revelation of God to the world of men. If we are to continue the line of reasoning suggested by our hypothesis, we must then assert that the primary characteristic of the Johannine community is precisely that of a prophetic, charismatic or pneumatic community.[1] Revelation, the primary function of the mission of Jesus, is therefore an ongoing activity within the life of the community, and more particularly, the primary characteristic which marks out the Johannine community. Just as in Old Testament prophetic literature and in the fragments of early Christian prophecy which have survived, there is some evidence to suggest that within the cultic assembly of the Johannine community, the prophetic phenomenon was accompanied by both visions and auditions.[2]

The Cultic Vision of the Exalted Jesus

As the focal point of early Christian eschatological expectation, the Parousia had both a soteriological and a juridical function. Soteriologically, it envisioned the final unity of the exalted Lord of the church with his people. Juridically, it signified the final and decisive bestowal of condemnation upon all those who had refused to respond with belief to the proclamation of gospel. In view of the great soteriological importance of the Parousia in the future, it would be remarkable if this experience were not somehow drawn into the present and actualized within the context of early Christian cultic worship.[3] In Israelite worship, the theophany, or cultic "coming" of Yahweh occupied the central moment of the cultic act.[4] Both salvation and judgment were produced by this cultic

[1] In Judaism, the Spirit of God was primarily thought of as the Spirit of prophecy; cf. E. Sjöberg, *"Pneuma,* etc.," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament,* VI, 381-82.

[2] Continuity between Old Testament and New Testament prophetic and revelatory phenomena has lately been stressed by Johannes Lindblom, *Gesichte und Offenbarungen: Vorstellungen von göttlichen Weisungen und übernatürlichen Erscheinungen im ältesten Christentum* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1968).

[3] *Supra,* p. 14: "Within the context of worship the final goal of history is proleptically present to the worshippers; past and future merge into present cultic experience."

[4] Artur Weiser, *The Psalms: A Commentary,* trans. Herbert Hartwell (The Old Testament Library; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), p. 29. Cf. Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Worship in Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament,* trans. Geoffrey Buswell (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966), pp. 170-71, 220-21.

"coming".[1] In early Christian worship, the fact that the Parousia of the exalted Lord was both expected and experienced in the celebration of the eucharist,[2] underlines the function of the cult in the realization of eschatological expectation. In discussing the "cultic vision of the exalted Jesus" hypothetically experienced by the Johannine community at worship, we do not mean to imply that this cultic experience was unique to this community. The very fact that the resurrection appearances of the risen Jesus preserved in gospel tradition show telltale signs of having originated both formally and materially within a cultic setting would seem to indicate the widespread nature of this cultic experience within the primitive church.[3]

The final goal of eschatological salvation, according to John 17:24, is to "see the glory of Jesus" in protological and eschatological unity with the Father. This is wholly future. The quality of "glory" was perceived by eyes of faith during the earthly life of Jesus through the signs which he performed (John: 2:11; 11:4, 30; 12:28). The supreme manifestation of "glory" became evident upon the final "glorification" of Jesus, an event which included the passion, death, resurrection and ascension (7:39; 11:4; 12:28). Since the glory of Jesus was visible in the past, during his life and culminating with his death, and will again be visible to believers in the future when they behold the glory of Jesus in his unity with the Father, can it be that only in the present era, the era in which the Johannine community lives, that the glory of Jesus is invisible? The probable answer is no. The *Sitz im Leben* of the realized eschatology of the Fourth Gospel is the pneumatic worship, preaching and teaching of the Johannine community in which the vision of the living and exalted Jesus seen in his eschatological and Parousia glory was perceived by the believing congregation through the medium of illumination by the Spirit of God.

In John 12:39b-41, the prophetic vision of Yahweh experienced by Isaiah (cf. Isa. 6:1-13),[4] is interpreted by the Johannine

---

[1] Mowinckel, *Religion und Kultus*, pp. 76-78.

[2] Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 290-91; Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, p. 16.

[3] Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, pp. 13-14.

[4] J. Kenneth Kuntz, *The Self-Revelation of God* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967), pp. 154-62. Kuntz has an excellent discussion of the cultic context of Isaiah's inaugural theophany together with the elements derived from the Sinai tradition which it (and other Old Testament theo-

community as a vision of the pre-incarnate, incarnate and crucified Jesus.[1] The later speculation of Jewish Merkabah mysticism (of which Peder Borgen considers Johannine "mysticism" an early sidebranch) [2] thought that Isaiah's vision implied a visionary ascent to heaven[3], a view anticipated by the Ascension of Isaiah, a document which may have been written in the second century A. D.[4] John 8:56 assumes a similar visionary experience on the part of Abraham,[5] and John 3:13 seems to reflect the Sinaitic vision of Yahweh experienced by Moses together with his supposed ascension into the heavenly realms.[6] Frequently in the prophetic visions narrated in the Old Testament, the seer finds himself transported to the heavenly world where he learns of impending earthly events by eavesdropping on the deliberations of the divine council over which Yahweh presides.[7]

Similar prophetic visions and auditions took place in the early church, as the quotation of Joel 2:28-32 in Acts 2:16-21 programmatically suggests,[8] and as a number of fragmentary examples both from Acts and from other early Christian documents confirms. In Acts 7:55f., Stephen, inspired by the Spirit of God (6:5, 10f.), looked into the open heavens and beheld a vision of the glory of

phanies) contains. Elements of the Sinai tradition (i.e. the equation of manna and Torah) have significantly affected the Christology of the midrashic homily in John 6 (cf. Borgen, *Bread from Heaven*, pp. 148-53, 156f., 175ff.).

[1] Dahl, "The Johannine Church and History," p. 132.

[2] Borgen, *Bread from Heaven*, pp. 3, 147.

[3] Dahl, "The Johannine Church and History," p. 131.

[4] J. Flemming and H. Duensing, "The Ascension of Isaiah," *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. Edgar Hennecke and Wilhelm Schneemelcher, trans. R. McL. Wilson, *et al.*, II (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), 643.

[5] Dahl, "The Johannine Church and History," p. 134.

[6] While John 3:13 has ordinarily been regarded as a general polemic against the heavenly ascents of apocalyptic seers (cf. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 107; Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 72; Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, p. 145), Meeks has convincingly demonstrated that this polemic is specifically directed toward heterodox Jewish conceptions of Moses' ascension into the heavenly world (*The Prophet-King*, pp. 296-301). This polemic together with that against Jewish worship (cf. John 4:26) is probably motivated by the great similarity between the views of the Johannine community and those of their heterodox Jewish opponents.

[7] J. F. Ross, "The Prophet as Yahweh's Messenger," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1962), pp. 98-107; F. M. Cross, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, XII (1953), 274-77; D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), 166-69.

[8] Cf. Lindblom, *Gesichte und Offenbarungen*, pp. 175-76.

God and Jesus standing at his right hand.[1] The phenomenological similarity between this vision and that of Isaiah is striking,[2] making the proper interpretation of the significance of this passage in Acts absolutely crucial.

Particularly striking is the pneumatic inspiration of Stephen (Acts 7:55), which is not unrelated to his previous proclamation of an inspired message (6:3, 10). The stereotyped language describing the opening of the heavens, common in late Judaism, early Christianity and Gnosticism, underlines the formal revelatory nature of this vision.[3] Stephen's vision of the glory of God, comparable to the Johannine community's conception of the object of Isaiah's vision, calls to mind the importance of the term δόξα in the theology of the Fourth Gospel, and may suggest the origin of the term within a cultic vision context. Stephen's perception of the Son of man "standing" *ad dextram Dei* (this is probably a Lukan way of combining the "sitting" and "coming" elements found curiously united in Mark 14:62),[4] calls to mind the Parousia imagery found in such passages as Mark 9:1; 13:26; 14:62; Rev. 1:7.

While some[5] have formulated the hypothesis that Acts 7:56 reflects a Lukan de-eschatolization of the Parousia hope into a present and individualized Christian experience of the Parousia at death (particularly the death of martyrdom), C. K. Barrett sees this passage not as a proleptic experience of the Parousia on an individual level, but rather as an actual personal and individual Parousia taking place for the benefit of Stephen himself.[6] The

---

[1] See the short but excellent discussion of this passage as it relates to the Son of man figure in Heinz Eduard Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965), pp. 303-5 (Exursus II).

[2] Lindblom, *Gesichte und Offenbarungen*, p. 56.

[3] Cf. W. C. van Unnik, "Die 'geöffneten Himmel' in der Offenbarungsvision des Apokryphon des Johannes," *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1964), pp. 269-80; Fritzleo Lentzen-Deis, "Das Motiv der 'Himmelsöffnung' in verschiedenen Gattungen der Umweltliteratur des Neuen Testaments," *Biblica*, L (1969), 301-27; Lindblom, *Gesichte und Offenbarungen*, p. 155.

[4] Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*, p. 177.

[5] Cf. Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1960), p. 115. This view, however, is much older; cf. Gustaf Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, trans. D. M. Kay (Edingburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909), p. 311.

[6] C. K. Barrett, "Stephen and the Son of Man," *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1964), p. 36. Barrett sees the use of the title Son of man Acts 7:56 as part of the Lukan rewriting of early Christian eschatology (p. 35).

weaknesss of this interpretation is that there is no significant supporting evidence in the form of functional parallels outside of Luke-Acts.[1] What Luke has actually done, it seems to me, is to incorporate a very old cultic vision-form of the exalted and coming Son of man into a new context in which the bestowal of eschatological salvation (upon Stephen) and eschatological judgment (upon his murderers) is actualized prior to the complete arrival of the eschaton.[2] Another significant feature of the account of Stephen's vision in Acts is the description of the angelic nature of his countenance (6:15). As we shall shortly see, partial assimilation to a heavenly form of existence is frequently indispensable for the reception of both heavenly visions and ascents into the heavenly realm. Each of these formal features of Stephen's vision—pneumatic inspiration, the vision of the open heavens, the Son of man as the essential object of the vision and the transformation of the seer—points to the origin of this prophetic vision in a cultic setting.

[1] To interpret the "coming" of Jesus in the Farewell Discourses of the Fourth Gospel as a "coming" experienced by a Christian martyr at the moment of death is, as we shall see (*infra*, pp. 128ff). inadequate. While Lake and Cadbury suggest that the vision of God is the usual consolation of the martyr, the parallel which they suggest in the Martyrdom of Polycarp 5:2 contains nothing which can be construed as a vision *of God* by Polycarp and he certainly has no such experience immediately prior to death; cf Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, *English Translation and Commentary*, Vol. IV of *The Acts of the Apostles*, Part I of *The Beginnings of Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1965), p. 84. The death of James the Just, described by Hegesippus (in Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* 2. 23. 13), is apparently modelled after the death of Stephen in Acts. However, James reportedly says, "Why do you ask me about the Son of man? He is seated in heaven at the right hand of the great power, and is about to come on the clouds of heaven." James does not have a vision of the exalted Son of man, nor is he directly dependent on the words of Stephen in Acts 7:55f. (n.b. the Ebionite opposition to visions), but is rather dependent on Luke 22:69, with the "coming" motif the probable result of a conflation of Matt. 26:64 and Mk. 14:62. James is therefore not depicted as experiencing an individualized Parousia in vision form.

[2] The substitution in Lk. 22:69 of the phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν for ὄψεσθε in his source (Mk. 14:62)—n.b. the conflation of the two ideas in Matt. 26:64: ἀπ' ἄρτι ὄψεσθε—is not motivated necessarily by a Lukan emphasis on an individualized Parousia (contra Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*, p. 177), but seems rather to be motivated by a desire on the part of Luke to lessen the emphasis on the vision form of the Parousia for the high priest. Regardless of the emphasis on "you will see" in Mk. 14:62 (Perrin, following Lindars, sees the origin of this emphasis in a "Christian passion-apologetic"), the ὄψεσθε of John 1:51 is not a vision beheld by the Jews, but rather a vision by believers, the context of which vision underlines for its beholders the messianic status of Jesus.

Stephen's vision is closely connected with the vision which Jesus predicts for the high priest in Mark 14:62, where (unlike Acts 7: 55f.) it is undoubtedly the future Parousia which is in view, and not a proleptic experience of that event. Again we meet the stereotyped language of the revelation-form, or of the prophetic vision-form which links the exalted Son of man with the Parousia, or "coming" motif. A striking feature of this text, which is an obvious Markan addition to the passion narrative,[1] is the proximity of the titles "Son" and "Son of man," a phenomenon also reflected in John 5:19-29, and which must therefore (against S. Schulz) be seen as pre-Johannine. Both Acts 7:55f. and Mark 14:62 reflect the activity of a line of early Christian exegetical tradition which has been developed through the combination of Psalm 110:1 with Daniel 7:13.[2] The *Sitz im Leben* of this exegetical development may well have been the worshipping Christian communities of Syria-Palestine, in which the exalted Lord and coming Son of man were the objects of prophetic vision within a cultic setting.[3] The inappropriateness of the insertion of Mark 14:62 within the passion narrative becomes clear when it is realized that although the high priest is told "you will see" the Parousia of the Son of man, he did not see the Parousia since he had been dead long before the composition of the second gospel. Both Acts 7:55f. and Mark 14:62 appear to have originally been fragments reflecting the cultic vision of the exalted and coming Son of man which were incorporated into new and totally different contexts by Mark and Luke respectively. That is to say that not only did the expectation of the Parousia with its attendant constellation of imagery affect the present actualization of that event within the cult, but the way in which the Parousia was actualized in present cultic experience (e.g. through the exegetical tradition which combined Psalm 110:1 with Daniel 7:13) also radically affected the way in which the Parousia was conceptualized as a future event. More simply put, the doctrine of the future Parousia and the present cultic experience of the Parousia have had a reciprocal effect on one another. It is therefore as inaccurate to say that Acts 7:55f. represents a de-eschatolization of the Parousia

[1] Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, p. 270.

[2] See Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 173-85.

[3] Thereby revealing the existence of a "Jesus cult" in Palestine before the expansion of Christianity into Gentile regions (against W. Bousset and R. Bultmann); cf. *supra*, p. 98, n. 2.

as it is to say that Mark 14:62 represents an eschatolization of the cultic experience of the Parousia. Those who hypothesize a unilinear development from eschatology to cult have grossly oversimplified the history of early Christian theology.[1]

Another interesting example of a prophetic vision within the early church is that found in the opening chapter of the Apocalypse of John.[2] Here again we find the seer in possession of the Spirit of God (Rev. 1:10), and he subsequently receives a glorious vision of the Son of man (1:12-16), which proves to be a prelude to the opening of the heavenly door (4:1). Subsequently the seer ascends into the heavenly world where he receives a vision of God (4:2-6). All of this occurs immediately after a clear statement of the Parousia hope held by the seer in Rev. 1:7: "Behold he is coming with the clouds, and every eye will see him, every one who pierced him, and all tribes of the earth will wail on account of him." In the initial vision of the seer, the object of that vision was the Son of man, who grants him an audition as well as a vision. It is this same Son of man who will come with clouds at the end of the age in judgment. Nevertheless within the present context is every possibility that his "coming" will be realized proleptically in the present experience of the Seven Churches of Asia Minor (Rev. 2:5, 16).[3]

A final example of prophetic or pneumatic visions of the exalted Jesus is that experienced by Paul on the road to Damascus (Acts 9:1-9; 22:3-11; 26:9-18), and perhaps repeated in his experience (II Cor. 12:1-4). Whatever one may think of the accuracy or historicity of the Lukan account, this experience was certainly interpreted by Paul himself as a "revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1:12, 16), and must have been accompanied by an audition more extensive than the one recorded in Acts since he claims to have derived his gospel from it (I Cor. 9:1; 15:8-10). It is important to recognize the place which the Old Testament played in Paul's interpretation of this vision-audition on the Damascus road. His allusion in Gal. 1:15 to Jeremiah's divine call and commission (Jer. 1:4f.), reveals the extent to which his own experience was interpreted analogously with that of the prophet Jeremiah. The vision of Isaiah was perhaps of even greater importance for Paul's understanding of this experience.

---

[1] *Supra*, p. 16.

[2] For an excellent discussion of the visions of the Apocalypse, see Lindblom, *Gesichte und Offenbarungen*, pp. 206-39.

[3] *Infra*, p. 127.

These functional parallels to the Johannine understanding of the vision of Isaiah reveal the phenomenological similarities between the cultic visions of both Israelite and early Christian prophets. Beyond that, the use of Parousia imagery in contexts wherein a future Parousia of the Son of man is not primarily in view, opens up the possibility for recognizing the important place of the prophetic vision of the exalted Jesus and the coming Son of man within the cultic worship of early Christianity.[1] This vision of the *sessio ad dextram Dei* can be viewed from two perspectives. Either, (1) the prophet and/or the cultic community view themselves as being eschatologically transported to the heavenly realm (as in the Qumran Ḥodayoth, the visions of the seer of the Apocalypse and Paul and the Odes of Solomon), or else (2) the prophet and/or the worshipping community may view the object of their vision as "coming" to them (as in the vision of Stephen, the initial vision of the seer of the Apocalypse of John and the Johannine community in the Farewell Discourses of Jesus). Regardless of precisely how the future is thought to be actualized in the present, the cult is the primary setting for that actualization.

With this background, we may proceed to the interpretation of the *crux interpretum* for our hypothesis of the *visio Christi* as central point of the Johannine cultus, John 1:51: "Truly, truly, I say to you, you will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." [2] Most interpreters see in this passage a reference to the vision of Jacob in Genesis 28 in which the figure of the Son of man has replaced the ladder, and has become the new means for connecting heaven and earth.[3] As it stands, the saying is certainly unrelated to its present context, but we need not on that account interpret it figuratively.[4] It seems

[1] Cf. Hebrews 2:8b-9a: "As it is, we do not yet see everything in subjection to him, but we see Jesus . . . crowned with glory and honor . . ." If we accept the possibility that the language of this passage stems from the cultic anticipation of the Parousia by actualizing it in present experience in the Spirit, we find a further confirmation of our hypothesis (cf. *supra*, pp. 12-14).

[2] For the correlation of this passage with those which similarly reflect the cultic "coming" of the exalted Jesus, see *infra*, pp. 126 ff.

[3] For the various views on this passage see Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, pp. 88-91.

[4] Brown, who regards John 1:51 as a detached saying, observes that "to give meaning to 51 in its present sequence we must look for a figurative meaning which can be fulfilled in the immediate future of the ministry, even as 50 is fulfilled at Cana" (*Ibid.*, p. 89). Brown's solution, however,

perfectly clear that the basic elements of John 1:51 reflect the Parousia imagery which we have met elsewhere in the New Testament. The verb ὄψεσθε ("you will see") is found in connection with the Parousia in Mark 14:62 (et par. Matt. 26:64); 13:26; Revelation 1:7. The figure of the Son of man, ultimately derived from Daniel 7:13, is another indispensable element of New Testament Parousia references (Mk. 13:26; 14:62; Matt. 24:30; Acts 7:56; cf. Heb. 2:5-9). The angelic company is similarly reminiscent of the host that will accompany the return of Jesus (I Thess. 3:13; II Thess. 1:7). Nevertheless, this passage is certainly not a reference to the future Parousia; the appropriate imagery is present, but it is being utilized in quite a different manner.

The opening of the heavens in John 1:51, as we have seen, reflects the stereotyped literary revelation-form common in late Judaism and early Christianity. The angelic traffic between heaven and earth, as we have already noted in our consideration of the eschatology of the Qumran community,[1] and will shortly discuss in our treatment of the Odes of Solomon,[2] the presence of angelic beings within the context of worship in the early church was one of the persistent ways in which the presence of the worshipping community in heaven was proleptically experienced.[3] The use of these motifs within John 1:51 is a decisive clue that what the Fourth Evangelist has in view through the inclusion of this independent fragment within the narrative is not to anticipate an event (either figurative or literal) that would transpire sometime during his unfolding of the gospel story (for nothing corresponding to this prediction does in fact occur), but is rather the kind of event which the Johannine community experienced pneumatically within the context of the community at worship.[4]

is a synthesis which is quite unconvincing: "No one of these variations is particularly convincing. However, in the theme that they have in common they are probably correct; whether it is as the ladder, the *shekinah*, the *merkabah*, Bethel, or the rock, the vision means that Jesus as Son of man has become the locus of divine glory, the point of contact between heaven and earth. The disciples are promised figuratively that they will come to see this; and indeed, at Cana they do see his glory."

[1] *Supra*, pp. 32-33, n. 2.

[2] *Infra*, pp. 178f., 187.

[3] Cf. Erik Peterson, *Das Buch von den Engeln: Stellung und Bedeutung der heiligen im Kultus* (Leipzig: Jakob Hegner, 1935), pp. 17f.: "Alle Kulthandlungen der Kirche wären dann entweder als eine Teilnahme der Engel am irdischen Kult, oder umgekehrt, aller irdische Kult der Kirche wäre als ein Teilnehmen an dem Kult, der Gott in Himmel von den Engel dargebracht wird, zu verstehen,"

[4] *Infra*, pp. 126-133. In the short but valuable study by Gilles Quispel,

In this respect, the observations of Hugo Odeberg (with certain necessary modifications) should be taken quite seriously with regard to the interpretation of John 1:51 and parallels:

> . . . the former, as we have seen, refers to the opening of the faculty of vision in the spiritual world, by which believers 'will see the connexion being brought about between the celestial appearance, the *doxa* of Christ, and his appearance in the flesh' and the latter, to repeat, 'refers to a spiritual experience with the believer, in which the Son of Man as united with him and abiding in him, is elevated to the believer's spiritual gaze, so that the believer *ascends* in aspiring ever upwards towards the *doxa* of the Celestial Son of Man.'[1]

However, in place of Odeberg's hypothesis of the individual believer's experience of "salvation mysticism" we must insist on substituting the corporate experience of the Johannine community assembled for worship.

In John 1:51, therefore, we have "a heavenly vision of the Son of man in glory, attended by angels,"[2] and yet paradoxically present in the midst of the worshipping community. The passage contains allusions and imagery drawn from traditional descriptions of the Parousia, an event which is both anticipated in the future and experienced in the present cultic moment.

If the heterodox Jewish salvific goal of the *visio Dei*, described in terms of traditions drawn from the Sinaitic theophany experienced by Moses,[3] has been transformed by the Johannine community

"Nathanael und der Menschensohn (Joh 1:51)," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLVII (1956), 281-83, the author sees John 1:51, as 12:41, as a vision of Christ in heavenly splendor appearing to Nathanael reflecting a background in esoteric Judaism, i.e., Merkabah mysticism.

[1] Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 268. This quotation is taken from the midst of a discussion of John 6:26-71 (pp. 235-69), in which Odeberg treats the phrase "to see the Son of Man" (John 6:40, 62), and then refers back to John 1:51 and 3:14f. Odeberg's discussion of John 1:51 is found on pp. 33-42.

[2] A. J. B. Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man* (London: Lutterworth, 1965), p. 159.

[3] Meeks, *The Prophet-King*, pp. 318f.: ". . . the Johannine traditions were shaped, at least in part, by interaction between a Christian community and a hostile Jewish community whose piety accorded very great importance to Moses and the Sinai theophany, probably understood as Moses' ascent to heaven and his enthronement there. Second, it is clear that the Johannine church had drawn members from that Jewish group as well as from the Samaritan circles which held very similar beliefs, and it has been demonstrated to a high degree of probability that the depiction of Jesus as prophet and king in the Fourth Gospel owes much to traditions which the church inherited from the Moses piety." Although in many cases proof is lacking,

into a *visio Christi* (*ad dextram Dei*), then the motivations for the Fourth Gospel's polemic against the Jewish belief that Moses had seen God (cf. John 1:18), and had ascended into the heavenly realm (cf. John 3:13), become clear. The phenomenological similarity between the Moses piety of the Jews and the Jesus piety of the Johannine community was the source of mutual threat and recrimination. Just as Jewish mystics desired to experience the *visio Dei* in an anticipatory way,[1] so the Johannine church experienced the *visio Christi* in a cultic setting. John 3:13, which contains a polemic against those who claim to have ascended into the heavenly realm,[2] should not be interpreted to exclude that experience on the part of the Johannine community.[3] The prophetic revelation of the exalted and glorified Jesus was mediated to the community through just such visionary and auditionary pneumatic experiences. Additional confirmation for this position is found in John 3:11f., where there is a very abrupt shift in person and number:

> Truly, truly, I say to you, we speak of what we know, and bear witness to what we have seen; but you do not receive our testimony. If I have told you earthly things and you do not believe, how can you believe if I tell you heavenly things?

Here the current experience of the Johannine community has been retrojected into the mouth of the Johannine Jesus in order to gain authentification and authority. It is precisely the pneumatically experienced *visio Christi* of that community which guarantees the truth of the message which they proclaim.

What can the provisional recognition of the validity of this hypothesis possibly contribute to our understanding of the realized eschatology of the Fourth Gospel? First of all, the reality of the cultic vision of the exalted Son of man means that the eschatological dispenser of life and judgment is either present through the mediation of inspired cult personnel, or realistically present in cultic visions beheld by the congregation assembled for worship. Just

the thought provoking book by B. W. Bacon, *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, contains many views on the origin of the Fourth Gospel which are congruent with those expressed by Meeks in this quotation, as well as for the over-all hypothesis for which we ourselves are arguing in the Fourth Gospel.

[1] Cf. b. Haggigah 14b: "The teacher of R. Jose the Priest says he saw them seated on Mt. Sinai; heard heavenly voices saying 'Ascend hither, you and your disciples are destined to be in the third set (of angels) singing continually before the Shekinah.'"

[2] *Supra*, p. 91. n. 6.

[3] Against Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, trans. Kevin Smyth, I (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968), pp. 392f., cf. p. 128.

as the extra-cultic vision of the exalted Jesus by Paul convinced him of the messianic status of Jesus, so the cultic vision of the exalted Jesus makes his messianic status completely self-evident to the beholder. The eschatological gift of life infuses the believer, while the unbeliever (whether present at Christian worship, as in the Pauline communities, cf. I Cor. 14:23-25, or absent) receives proleptic judgment.[1]

Since the Johannine cult was the means of maintaining both communion and communication between the exalted Jesus and his believing community, the possession of divine life becomes the indispensable presupposition for the continued visionary experiences and (possibly) heavenly ascents.[2] Heterodox Judaism interpreted the ascent of Moses to Mount Sinai as an ascension into the heavenly world where a *visio Dei* was received by the prophet. In order for an ascent of this kind to be possible, some kind of bodily transformation or assimilation to a heavenly mode of existence had to be experienced.[3] Philo, in describing the ascent of Moses as a second birth (δεύτερα γένεσις),[4] comes remarkably close to the Johannine rationale for the "birth from above" (John 3:3, 7; cf. 1:13), a concept which is certainly not of traditional Jewish origin.[5] In the thought of the Fourth Evangelist, this kind of transformation is not only a prelude to a more complete attainment of the eschatological mode of existence, but is also the basis upon which the recognition of the eschatological glory of Jesus within the cultic

[1] Cf. Kuntz, *The Self-Revelation of God*, p. 220: "The study of theophany is most relevant . . . for in such cultic meeting, the encounter between God and man, between Yahweh and people occurred. The *hieros logos* was enunciated, and the decisive soteriological and judicial acts of the deity were conducted. Whatever might have been the partially stereotyped forms that obtained, Yahweh's theophanic presence in cultic meeting was a dynamic presence that was confronted in both awe and trembling, on the one hand, and in exultation and enthusiasm on the other." Although discussing Old Testament theophanies, I think that his words equally apply to the Johannine cultic Christophany.

[2] The similarities between the Essenes of Qumran, the Egyptian Jewish community called the Therapeutae and the syncretistic Hellenistic communities which produced the Hermetic corpus make it difficult to distinguish between Jewish and Hellenistic mysticism.

[3] Meeks, *The Prophet-King*, p. 242.

[4] Philo *Quaest. in Ex.* 2. 46: "But the calling above of the prophet is a second birth better than the first." Quoted from Philo, *Questions and Answers on Exodus*, trans. Ralph Marcus (The Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 91.

[5] On this question see C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: S. P. C. K., 1955), pp. 171ff.

setting is predicated. The same idea of the necessity of a transformation before entry into the heavenly realm is stressed by Odeberg together with a wealth of illustrative and supportive material:

> In order to enter the highest heaven, the Celestial Realm, the ascending human being must change into fire, taking on a body of light, or, as it is also expressed, put on 'garments of light'. When Enoch was made into a Celestial Being, called Metatron, he was changed 'from flesh into fire' 3 Enoch 15. The best illustration to this sphere of ideas may be brought from I Cor. 15.40ff. . . . There is also in mystic notions from different times and places of origin a common idea of an inner, spiritual 'body' sometimes viewed as merely latent in earthly men and brought into life only in the hereafter, sometimes as the conscious possession even during earthly life of the twice-born, who as a consequence, are able to perceive and act both in the earthly world and the spiritual world.[1]

To this point in our discussion of the communal setting and socio-religious environment out of which the Fourth Gospel arose, we have attempted to underline the significance of four important points: (1) The discourses of the Johannine Jesus bear unmistakeable marks of having been formulated by prophetic or charismatic individuals within the context of the pneumatic worship of the Johannine community. (2) The Johannine Jesus was relevant for the faith and life of the community primarily because he was the personification and embodiment of the religious needs, values and aspirations of the community projected onto and superimposed over the historical Jesus. (3) Consequently, the Christological orientation of the Fourth Gospel, properly understood, tells us far more about the Johannine community than it does about the Jesus of history. If the realization of eschatological salvation is functionally derivative from Johannine Christology, and the Johannine Jesus is in reality a reflection of the salvific needs and ideals of the community, then the present realization of eschatological life has an exclusive locus in the ecclesial setting of the cult and piety of the Johannine community. (4) The cultic worship of the Johannine community provided a present experience of the exalted and living Jesus in terms of the recurring actualization of his future Parousia. This recurring culting "coming" of the exalted Jesus was conceptualized in terms of traditional Christian

[1] Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 68f.

Parousia imagery, and was directly experienced by the worshipping congregation "in the Spirit," or alternately as a presence mediated through the office of prophetic personalities.

The Character of the Realized Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel

Thus far we have particularly concerned with a number of crucial issues which are antecedent to a successful consideration of the peculiar nature of Johannine eschatology. The problem presented by Johannine eschatology cannot be solved simply by recognizing, or by attempting to reconcile or maintain the present and future elements. Nor is the problem solved by superficial attempts to account for the supposed "transformation" of futuristic eschatology into realized eschatology. Rather, the solution to the problem lies in the determination of the function of this eschatology within the Johannine cultic community, the meaning which it held for them in concert with their religious values and experiences, together with the precise mode of conceptualization whereby the community conceived of this eschatology as "realized." With this proper focus on the problem, we then proceeded to discuss the character, values and concerns of the Johannine community as they are expressed in the person of the Johannine Jesus. We discovered that the Johannine community may be thoroughly characterized as a prophetic, pneumatic or charismatic community in which the present and cultically actualized experience of the vision of the exalted Jesus provides the indispensable preparation and anticipation of the ultimate future eschatological vision of the glory of Jesus. In contrast with parallels from Jewish and Hellenistic mysticism, however, this experience cannot be accurately described as "mystical" without careful definition and qualification. The cultic Christophany which produced both salvation and judgment occured within the context of Christian worship, thereby placing the communal orientation of the realization of eschatological salvation within the Fourth Gospel in sharp contrast with individual mystical ecstasies. The cultic community, in short, was the locus for realized eschatology. We have now to discuss the major ways in which the present actualization of eschatological salvation was conceptualized by the community, a discussion which we will preface by a short but necessary discussion of the place of the Spirit in the eschatology of the Fourth Gospel.

The Spirit in Johannine Eschatology

Large segments of late Judaism were profoundly conscious of the absence of the Spirit of God from their midst. The striking exception to this frequently overemphasized generalization is the Essene community at Qumran, and it is primarily on the basis of their belief in the presence of the Spirit within their community that it is possible to attribute a variety of realized eschatology to them.[1] In early Christianity, the presence of the Spirit within the community was the central phenomenon which convinced Christians that the eschaton had in some decisive way arrived in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. It was on this basis as well that the future completion of the eschatological salvation which had been inaugurated in their experience was assured. The necessity of reading the Fourth Gospel against the background of first century Judaism both in its orthodox and heterodox forms and presuppositions means that it is also neccesary to view the belief of the Johannine community in their present possession of the Spirit as an indication of the radical distinction which existed between them and contemporary Judaism.

In the Johannine view, possession of the Spirit of God is the primary means for determining whether one belongs essentially to the heavenly or the earthly realm. The possession of the Spirit presupposes a "rebirth from above" (John 3:3, 7), an event achieved through the agency of the Spirit-Paraclete (3:5f.),[2] which lifts a man out of his earthly orientation and origin and makes it possible to affirm of him (as of the paradigmatic Johannine Jesus), that he is "not of this world" (17:14).[3] It is on this basis that a man is removed from the sphere of the flesh and transferred to the sphere of the Spirit (3:6), or from the sphere of death to the sphere of life (5:24).[4] Scott's description of this

[1] *Supra*, pp. 34f.

[2] The reference to "water and the Spirit" in John 3:5 seems to connect baptism with the bestowal of the Spirit-Paraclete. Although Bultmann views "water and" as a redactional insertion into the text, the reference is not inconsistent with Johannine thought (n.b. John 1:33!). Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 48-71, denies the allusion to baptism and sees instead "water and the Spirit" as the spiritual opposites of semen and flesh. Van Hartingsveld, *Die Eschatologie*, p. 88, follows Calvin in denying that John 3:5 contains a reference to baptism.

[3] Blank, *Krisis*, pp. 194ff., has an excellent excursus on the subject of the Johannine phrase "not of this world."

[4] Cf. Schweizer, "*Pneuma*, etc.," pp. 438ff.

transformation as "semi-physical," or "moral regeneration" (Scott thinks that Johannine thought oscillates between these two views), is unfortunate since the two emphases are not antithetical but complimentary.[1] The possession of the Spirit which results from rebirth is the guarantee that the proclamation of the Johannine community is a prophetic one uttered with the full authority of God (3:34).

As the hallmark of the followers of Jesus, the possession of the Spirit together with the resultant charismatic manifestations forms the basis for the new eschatological worship described in 4:23f.: "But the hour is coming and now is, when the true worshippers will worship the Father in Spirit and truth." Here the coming hour is identical with "that day" on which Christians will pray in the name of Jesus (16:26).[2] The statement in 4:23 was apparently made by the Johannine community in conscious opposition to contemporary Jewish worship which is viewed as invalid since its *raison d'être* is not the possession and manifestation of the Spirit. From the Johannine perspective, cultic worship is an enterprise which is carried out "in the Spirit," and is therefore an experience which modern interpeters ought not dilute into individualized mysticism or religious experience.[3] The actualization of eschatological salvation in cultic worship is apparent in the distinctive Johannine expression, "the hour is coming and now is."

In the Fourth Gospel, history is not divided into a series of epochs in which the period of the church is in any way marked off qualitatively from the period of the ministry of Jesus.[4] The real mission of Jesus has not been seriously interrupted by his passion, death, resurrection and ascension. In fact, it is precisely the totality of these events which serves to broaden and render more effective the ministry of Jesus through the gift to the community of the *alter ego* of Jesus, the Spirit-Paraclete. Both the

---

[1] Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 280.

[2] Sanders and Mastin, *The Gospel According to St. John*, p. 148: "It is only those who have received this power through Christ who can offer a real worship."

[3] Both Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 140, and Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, p. 180, caution against contrasting external worship with internal worship in this passage, an older approach common in the Idealism of liberal protestantism.

[4] In this the Fourth Gospel is decidedly unlike the historical schema presented in Luke-Acts; cf. Hans Conzelmann. *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. G. Buswell (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1960), pp., 149ff.

limitations and the particularities which characterized the historic mission of Jesus have been removed. It can therefore be said that the works performed by Jesus will be superseded by those of his followers (14:12), and that in all essentials his own mission is continued on in a plenipotentiary sense in that of the disciples (13:20; 17:18; 20:21b).

While the Spirit-Paraclete cannot be equated completely with Jesus, he does function in Johannine theology as the *alter ego* of Jesus. It is on this basis alone that the *via salutis* can be conceived of as an *imitatio Christi*, an *imitatio* which consists both in the conscious emulation of the paradigmatic Johannine Jesus as well as existence in the new style and mode of life resultant from the partial assimilation of the believer to a heavenly mode of existence through the "birth from above." All of the qualities and characteristics possessed and exercised by Jesus now devolve upon his followers because of their pneumatic assimilation to the heavenly realm, an assimilation celebrated and actualized in cultic worship.

Eternal Life in the Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel

The phrase "(eternal) life" in the Fourth Gospel, as in the synoptics, should be understood as "the life of the age to come," [1] and not in the Platonic sense of a timeless state of existence.[2] This is not only because the Fourth Gospel includes a future completion

[1] Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings*, p. 195. Ricca, *Die Eschatologie* p. 120, defines the term "eternal life" in what I consider a truly Johannine way by claiming that the term "designates the life of the future which has become present, and at the same time is life εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, that is, life directed toward the future, expecting its final completion in the future." Cf. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, p. 507.

[2] Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 150, defines eternal life in John as being similar to Philo in that both authors use the term in a Platonic sense of life lived in God's eternal today. Johannes Lindblom, *Das ewige Leben: Eine Studie über die Entstehung der religiösen Lebensidee im Neuen Testament* (Uppsala: A.-B. Akademiska Bokhandeln; Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1914), p. 236, sees eternal life in the Fourth Gospel as a timeless state which is an expression of "eine unmittelbare mystische Gemeinschaft mit Gott und Christus." Bacon, *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, p. 345, understands the term "eternal life" as equivalent to a "share in the world to come" to be a goal of Pharisaism in distinction to the Johannine meaning of the term. He goes on to say that "the life shared belonged to the present because the fellowship with the Father and the Son involves the continuous experience of the effects of redemptive power. It belongs to the future because the effects experienced are a pledge of greater things to come." Sanders and Mastin, *The Gospel According to St. John*, pp. 13f., views ζωή in the Fourth Gospel as having undergone a shift in meaning from "the life of the coming age" to "eternal life," from eschatology to ontology.

of present eschatological experience, but also because the rabbinic phrase "the age to come "is not exclusively temporal or horizontal in emphasis, but contains a spatial or vertical dimension as well.[1] The frequency with which the noun ζωή and its cognates occur within the Fourth Gospel,[2] together with the fact that this word-group occurs in conjunction with virtually all other constitutive concepts of Johannine theology underlines the significance which the term had for the Fourth Evangelist.[3]

In spite of van Hartingsveld's futile attempt to interpret eternal life in the Fourth Gospel as an eschatological gift of salvation which is only "promised" and appropriated in a preliminary way "by faith," [4] an examination of the contexts in which the term is found points in exactly the opposite direction. The decisive phrase in this connection is ἔχειν ζωὴν αἰώνιον, "to have/possess eternal life" (3:15, 36; 5:24, 40; 6:40, 47, 53, 68; 10:10; I John 3:13, 15; 5:12, 13, 16). Arguing from grammatical usage alone, the presumption is very strong—and indeed, the great majority of commentators accept the position without question—that the possession of "eternal life" from the Johannine perspective is decisively and emphatically a factor in the present experience of the believer. This, however, is not to deny the fact that there are other passages within Johannine literature which must unequivocally be interpreted as promising the bestowal of eternal life in the future (4:14, 36; 5:29; 6:27; 12:25; I Jn. 2:25). A cursory examination of the evidence has revealed the fact that in some sense eternal life in the theology of the Fourth Gospel is both a present possession and a future expectation. The conception of the futurity of eternal life is not difficult to comprehend, so we must primarily be concerned with understanding the manner in which eternal life may be said to be a present reality.

The quality of eternal life in the eschatology of the Fourth Gospel is primarily the possession of God alone; all other possession

---

[1] *Supra*, p. 58, n. 2.

[2] The noun ζωή occurs thirty-six times, the verb ζῆν seventeen times, and the compound verb ζῳοποιεῖν occurs three times in the Fourth Gospel. In the Johannine letters, the noun occurs thirteen times, the verb once.

[3] The term is found with the concepts light (1:4), knowledge (17:3), belief (3:5f., 36; 5:24; 6:40; 11:25; 20:31), water (3:5), the eucharist (6:51), love (15:1-13; cf. I Jn. 3:14) and "seeing" (14:19).

[4] Van Hartingsveld, *Die Eschatologie*, pp. 60ff., 74-80. Cf. Preiss, "Justification in Johannine Thought," p. 27, where he describes the Johannine possession of eternal life as a possession "in spe nondum in re."

of life is necessarily derivative from this divine source (5:26; 6:27). In the words of Johannes Lindblom:

> The ideal life is divine life, which is the primary possession of the divine persons, God and the Son of God as Logos and Christ, who existed before his revelation in the world of man and is independent of all human history.[1]

It would be incorrect to claim that this conception of life as the life of God betrays a Hellenistic rather than a Hebraic orientation.[2] Those who do make this claim usually define life in the Fourth Gospel as a timeless state of existence with Platonic or Graeco-Hellenistic affinities.[3] However, the possession of eternal life by Jesus and his followers in the Fourth Gospel is a dynamic rather than a static phenomenon, for Jesus *is* life (11:25; 14:6; I Jn. 1:1f.; 5:20), primarily because he communicates life (5:21, 26; I Jn. 5:12, 16).[4] The followers of Jesus who receive this divine gift receive it not as an inalienable right (for its continued possession is dynamically dependent on its continual appropriation),[5] but as a fruit of their continuing relationship with the exalted Jesus. This relationship is not mystical, but is communally oriented and cultically centered. The emphatic Johannine emphasis on maintaining unity with the Son and on "remaining in him," are simply expressions of the fact that the possession of divine life is indissolubly linked to a personal, communal and cultic relationship to the giver of life.[6] The Johannine depiction of Jesus as the posses-

---

[1] Lindblom, *Das ewige Leben*, p. 236.

[2] Against Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 252ff.

[3] *Supra*, p. 105, n. 2.

[4] Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 21, n. 3.

[5] Cf. Lindblom, *Das ewige Leben*, p. 236: "Der Besitz des göttlichen Lebens ist als völlig real zu betrachten. Er ist aber nicht mechanischer Natur. Er kann verloren gehen. Der Christ fällt, ja trotz des ihm innewohnenden göttlichen Wesens, tatsächlich in Sünden, und er kann sich wieder von Gott und Christus entfernen." This aspect of Johannine theology makes any theory of an ontological transformation of the individual believer antecedently impossible.

[6] Cf. Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 258: "This utterance [John 6:57] should be linked up with 5:26 . . . conveys the possession of the Divine Life as a real possession of those who have been born into the spiritual world; this possession of life, however, is not to be viewed as a possession, for each individual, of a separate 'life', a 'life' for himself, as an individual of the terrestrial world may look upon his 'body' as a separate entity, and speak of it as 'my flesh and blood', but the life possessed is the *one* life of the spiritual world, the life of the living Son, living through the Father."

sor of the divine life of the Father is, as we have seen,[1] in all probability a projection of the current beliefs of the Johannine community whereby their belief in the present possession of eschatological life was legitimated by the fact that the Johannine Jesus possessed eternal life.

While the rebirth from above which results in the possession of eternal life cannot be viewed as an ontological transformation of the individual believer, neither is it entirely appropriate to view it largely or exclusively as an ethical transformation. Years ago, E. F. Scott saw two conflicting elements which were polarized in the Fourth Evangelist's conception of union with Christ.[2] One conception of life was metaphysically conceived by the Evangelist in line with the Logos hypothesis, and semi-physically realized through a magical sacramental transaction.[3] The other concept of life, according to Scott, was ethically conceived in line with the historical revelation and grounded in a moral fellowship of believers with their Lord. In line with his perspective of liberal Idealism, Scott held that the ethical transformation theory was more basic to the Johannine conception of the *unio Christi.*

In more current discussion, this ethical orientation of the salvific transformation following heavenly rebirth has been rather inappropriately called "ethical dualism".[4] This term has been particularly applied to Johannine dualism in comparison with the dualism reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[5] A more appropriate catchword for this element of Johannine thought would be "relational dualism", a term which includes the ethical element, but

---

[1] *Supra*, pp. 82f.

[2] Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 294.

[3] Scott sees the moral fellowship conception at the basis of Johannine *unio Christi* primarily because he rejects the materialistic, "crude sacramentalism" of the Fourth Gospel.

[4] E. M. Sidebottom, *The Christ of the Fourth Gospel* (London: S. P. C. K., 1961), p. 128 speaks of the designation "ethical dualism" as an "extremely vague notion". Blank, *Krisis*, pp. 342ff. similarly rejects the term, as does Dahl, "The Johannine Church and History," p. 138.

[5] Cf. Matthew Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, p. 134. The inadequacy of the term "ethical dualism" is demonstrated by Hans Walter Huppenbauer's insistence that there are several kinds of dualism in the theology of the Qumran community; cf. Hans Walter Huppenbauer, *Der Mensch zwischen zwei Welten: Der Dualismus der Texte von Qumran (Höhle I) und der Damaskusfragmente, Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Evangeliums* (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Nr. 34; Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1959), pp. 103-15.

which also allows a fuller inclusion of the distinctive Johannine modes of appropriating and exhibiting the eschatological gift of eternal life.

The appropriation of eternal life on the part of a believing member of the Johannine community is both more than an ethical transformation and less than an ontological transformation in that the communal possession of the Spirit-Paraclete is the locus for the possession of eternal life. The possession of this life is coextensive with and exclusively limited to membership in the Christian community. Nevertheless, since the early Christian conception of the church was based on its definition as a voluntary association of believers, the importance of individual appropriation of the salvific benefits of Jesus can neither be ignored nor undervalued.[1] Individual decision and perseverance are the indispensable means for membership within the Christian community, yet eschatological salvation remains the possession of the cultic congregation. Possession of the Spirit of God together with the resultant possession of eternal life remains a community possession which the individual believer derives through his relationship to the exalted Jesus made possible through the cult. Therefore eternal life can only be considered "timeless" life in that it is primarily derived through the cult, and it is within the context of worship that past and future coalesce in present time.

The Fourth Evangelist devotes a great deal of space to the discussion of various modes of appropriating the eschatological gift of eternal life, modes which are not contradictory, but rather complimentary. While the content of eschatological salvation is exhausted in the term eternal life, the means by which this life is appropriated is variously described by the Fourth Evangelist as "belief," "obedience," "knowing," "hearing" and "seeing." The latter three are particularly significant for our purposes since they are closely associated with the idea of revelation.

The significance of the term "believe" for the Johannine community can be seen through the fact that it occurs some ninety-eight times within the Gospel. Its dynamic character is underlined by the fact that only the verb is found, and that frequently in

[1] Bacon, *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, p. 337, is quite in error when he observes that "the soteriology of the Fourth Gospel, however, is individual rather than social. 'Eternal life' for elect individuals, regardless of race or nationality, is the object in view."

the present tense. Belief is not subsequent to knowledge,[1] nor is it primarily a matter of intellectual assent to a body of religious knowledge.[2] Belief in the Fourth Gospel has a number of synonyms and implications which can best be seen through the elucidation of one literary form used not infrequently within the discourses of the Johannine Jesus.

The literary form in question is a poetic couplet whose members are either synthetically or antithetically parallel. The first member always deals with the present action of man, with a verb in the present tense and frequently containing some reference to the present realization of eschatological salvation. The second member includes a verb in the future tense and frequently relates to the individual's future or eschatological destiny. The stereotyped form of these pronouncements together with their dual emphasis on salvation and judgment suggests their possible origin in the eucharistic worship of the Johannine community. These Johannine pronouncements, some of which take the form of utterances of the exalted Jesus, bear more than a superficial resemblance in both form and content to Ernst Käsemann's "Sätze heiligen Rechtes" [3] and James M. Robinson's analysis of the two-member eschatological logia of Jesus.[4]

The first example of these Johannine eschatological pronouncements is drawn from John 3:36:

> The one who believes in the Son has eternal life,
> but the one who disobeys the Son shall not see life.

---

[1] Scott, *The Fourth Gospel,* pp. 271-77, sees obedience, knowledge and belief as three chronologically successive stages in the response of the individual to Jesus; in this he is certainly wrong.

[2] Against Scott, *The Fourth Gospel,* p. 52.

[3] Ernst Käsemann, "Sätze heiligen Rechtes im Neuen Testament," *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen,* II (2. Aufl.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), pp. 69-82.

[4] James M. Robinson, "The Formal Structure of Jesus' Message," *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation,* ed. W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1962), pp. 91-110. Cf. Robinson's observations on p. 97: "It is precisely this polarity in the message of Jesus that can be detected as a structuring tendency in the individual logia. One gradually catches sight of a structure in terms of two members, which can be related to the Jewish apocalyptic doctrine of two aeons as its *religionsgeschichtliche* background. The first member, the pronouncement to the present, is primarily related to the 'present evil aeon'; the second member, the allusion to the near future, looks to the 'aeon to come.'" On p. 98, Robinson describes this phenomenon as "eschatological polarity."

Here we note first of all the juxtaposition of realized and futuristic eschatology within the framework of one poetic couplet. Since this couplet is unquestionably Johannine, we are predisposed to view other Johannine logia with similar form and content as authentically Johannine. Further, the opposite of "believes" is not "disbelieves," as one might expect, but rather "disobeys." Belief therefore has an ethical dimension which cannot be ignored, making the concept of belief essentially synonymous with that of obedience. "Has" (ἔχει) in the first member is paralleled by "shall see" (ὄψεται; cf. John 1:51) in the second member, thereby indicating the synonymity of these terms. The future tense of the verb in the second member underlines the fact that for unbelievers life is neither a present nor a future possibility.

Another example of this Johannine pronouncement-form is found in John 5:24:

> The one who hears my word and believes in the one who sent me has eternal life,
> and shall not come into judgment,[1] but has passed from death to life.

From this passage we learn not only that "eternal life" may be equated with "life" in the religious thought of the Fourth Gospel (an equation which we have assumed), but also that "hearing" is antecedent to "believing," but is not to be equated with believing. The response of belief is predicated upon the proclamation of the message of Jesus, a message which continued to be proclaimed by the Johannine community with full divine authority. Just as life was a future impossibility for the disobedient (3:36), so judgment is a future impossibility for the believer. Finally, the second member suggests that the movement from death to life is a transference from one "sphere of power" to another.[2] This sphere of life, coextensive with the Johannine community, is the means whereby the heavenly realm penetrates the earthly realm.

In John 6:40 we find yet another example of the Johannine eschatological pronouncement saying:

---

[1] Εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται is present in tense, but ἔρχεται is really a futuristic use of the present tense as the use of κρινεῖ in the second member of the couplet in John 12:48 reveals. This use of ἔρχεται has been noted by C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (London: Oxford University Press, 1922), p. 94, where he sees the "futuram instans" use of the Aramaic participle behind the Greek expression.

[2] Blank, *Krisis*, pp. 131f.

> Everyone who sees the Son and believes in him has eternal life, and I will resurrect him on the last day.

Although Bultmann has viewed this passage as an interpolation by the Ecclesiasticall Redactor, its Johannine origin seems assured by its congruity in both form and content with other examples of this Johannine form which we have already discussed. In the first member of this pronouncement, "seeing" the Son (θεωρῶν τὸν υἱόν) is equated with "believing" the Son (πιστεύων εἰς αὐτόν). When we compare this equation with that found in John 3:36, we find the following chain of terms which are essentially synonyms: believing=obeying=seeing. We must go on to ask what kind of "seeing" of the Son (here equivalent to the Son of man, cf. John 6:53), is meant. In line with the hypothesis of the cultic vision of the exalted Jesus, which we have discussed at length above, we may define this "sight" as the perception of the exalted Jesus within a cultic setting in which he is recognized as the exalted Son of man. This perception of the messianic exaltation of Jesus compels the beholder to accept the messianic status of Jesus in precisely the same way that it compelled belief on the part of Paul upon the occasion of the Damascus road experience. This vision or perception of the exalted Jesus is an integral aspect of the realized eschatology of the Johannine community in that it is the cultic means whereby life is bestowed on the believing community.

Finally, we learn from the second member of John 6:40 that the present possession of life is a necessary presupposition for participation in the final resurrection. In Judaism, the reverse was true; the resurrection was the presupposition for the enjoyment of the life of the coming age.

A final example of this literary form so characteristic of the Johannine discourses is found in John 6:54:

> The one who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will resurrect him on the last day.

In this passage, the central means of appropriating eternal life is participation in the eucharistic worship of the community.[1] When

[1] It is primarily the fact that John 6:51b-58 refers to the eucharist in such an obvious way that some scholars have thought the passage to be an interpolation by a later redactor who, unlike the Fourth Evangelist, espoused the current "crude sacramentalism" of the early second century church. For example, Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 124, insists on viewing

the first member of this pronouncement is compared with the first members of the pronouncements in John 3:36 and 6:40, we arrive at a rather full configuration of those elements which are integral to the Johannine conception of what is involved in the present appropriation of eternal life. The chain of synonyms can thus be expanded to include the following terms: believing=obeying =seeing=eucharistic participation.

While eucharistic worship certainly occupied a central position in the cultus of the Johannine community, it cannot be given the independent significance which it came to have after the time of Augustine and Ambrose.[1] While in the later church the eucharist was the central way in which the cultic presence of the exalted Jesus was conceptualized, the pneumatic orientation of the Johannine community presupposes a cultic situation which is quite different. For the Johannine community, the Spirit-Paraclete mediated the presence of the exalted Son of man in a multiplicity of ways, of which eucharistic worship was but one. Other ways in which the presence of the exalted Jesus was conceptualized as present in the worship of the community included the cultic Christophanies whereby the Son of man bestowed both salvation and judgment in Parousia glory, the prophetic words uttered by members of the congregation and preserved in the Johannine discourses of Jesus, and the miraculous deeds which members of the community were enabled to perform. Rather than functioning as magical channels for the appropriation of divine grace and power, the eating and drinking of the eucharistic elements within the community was primarily an affirmation of, and a participation in, the historical existence and reality of Jesus. While there is little positive evidence that this emphasis in the eucharistic worship of the Johannine community was motivated by an anti-docetic stance, the strongly anti-docetic eucharistic theology of Ignatius of Antioch certainly has a close relationship with the eucharistic theology of the Johannine community.[2]

The absence of the Words of Institution from the Johannine

John 6:51, 53, and 56 as direct allusions to the eucharist as the "medicine of immortality," using an Ignatian phrase. It was the aim of the Fourth Evangelist, Scott continues, to substutite a deeper and more religious conception of the Supper than that found in the church of his time (*Ibid.*, p. 128).

[1] *Supra*, pp. 17f.

[2] *Infra*, pp. 147f.

account of the Last Supper, together with the total lack of explicit reference to the eucharist in the Fourth Gospel can best be explained by the theory advanced by Albert Schweitzer.[1] In his view, the Fourth Evangelist could not explicitly refer to the eucharist because its validity was indissolubly connected with the presence of the Spirit-Paraclete, a presence which was not realized until the work of redemption had been completed in the glorification of Jesus (John 7:39).[2] The significance of both baptism and the eucharist centers in the death of Christ, and it is through the Spirit working in cooperation with the water of baptism and the wine of the eucharist that the presence of Jesus continues on within the community.[3] Although Schweitzer erroneously limits the presence of the exalted Jesus to exclusively the sacraments, the main thrust of his interpretation remains valid.[4]

The final aspect of the significance of eternal life in the eschatology of the Fourth Gospel which requires investigation is the question of whether or not the Fourth Evangelist expresses a belief in the present realization of resurrection life, a characteristic feature of second century Gnosticism (cf. *supra*, p. 18, nn. 2, 3). A number of interpreters of the Fourth Gospel have answered this question in the affirmative; we must investigate the basis upon which such an affirmative answer has been given.

R. H. Charles thinks that a correct understanding of the term "eternal life" is essential for a proper knowledge of the Johannine teaching on the resurrection.[5] He emphasizes the fact that for the Evangelist, eternal life is the presupposition and germ of resurrection life (John 6:40), and even more significantly, "this eternal life which the believer at present possesses is already the resurrection life" (5:25).[6] Also citing John 11:25f. and 8:51, Charles concludes that "the spiritual resurrection life is synonymous with eternal life, and that eternal life in the fourth Gospel is not a time conception, but a purely ethical and timeless one." [7] The believer

[1] Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, trans. William Montgomery (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1931), pp. 349-72.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 353.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 358.
[4] The weaknesses inherent in other solutions to the sacramental problem of the Fourth Gospel may be seen in Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, pp. cxi-cxiv.
[5] Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 426f.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 427.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 428.

cannot lose this spiritual resurrection life when he dies, but rather enters into a fuller enjoyment of it, and only the righteous can share in that resurrection life.[1] On this basis, John 5:28f. cannot be judged merely as an accomodation by the Evangelist to current views, according to Charles, but must be viewed as contradicting the fundamental conceptions of his Gospel.[2] At the conclusion of his short discussion, Charles observes,

> Thus the Johannine teaching appears to be that in some form the resurrection life follows immediately upon death, but that its perfect consummation cannot be attained till the final consummation of all things.[3]

If we take Charles' words seriously, we find ourselves confronted with a three-stage conception of the resurrection: (1) the present possession of eternal life (=resurrection life), (2) some form of resurrection existence following immediately after death, and (3) the "perfect consummation" of resurrection life which cannot be attained until the final consummation of all things. One may legitimately question whether or not these three stages authentically reflect the eschatological thought of the Fourth Evangelist.

Ernst Käsemann, emphasizing the Gnostic origin of the Fourth Gospel, finds that John was dependent on "an enthusiastic piety which affirmed a sacramentally realized resurrection of the dead in the present." [4] Reflecting the enthusiastic piety of segments of the Corinthian church and II Timothy 2:18,[5] Käsemann believes that the Fourth Evangelist took a highly realistic view based on sacramentalism and transformed or corrected it [6] by basing the transformation of our existence rather on "the quickening word of Jesus." [7]

James M. Robinson sees John as the only one of the four canonical gospels to speak of resurrection in this life, and he supports this view (as did Charles), by referring to John 5:25 and 11:26.[8] The

[1] *Ibid.*
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 429.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 430.
[4] Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus*, p. 20.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 75.
[6] *Supra*, pp. 59f.
[7] Ernst Käsemann, "Zum Thema der urchristlichen Apokalyptik," *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, II (2. Aufl.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 120.
[8] James M. Robinson, "Kerygma and History in the New Testament," *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. J. Philip Hyatt (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), p. 127.

present realization of resurrection life in the Fourth Gospel is, according to Robinson, one of the fruits of the higher understanding mediated by the Spirit. Unlike Käsemann, who stresses the significance of the word of Jesus over against the sacraments, Robinson thinks that the Fourth Evangelist avoids the category of baptismal resurrection and substitutes for it the category of baptismal regeneration.[1]

Let us now test the validity of this position, advocated in different, but at the same time strikingly similar ways by Charles, Käsemann, Robinson and others.[2] Each of the positions outlined above appears to share a number of common factors: (1) eternal life is viewed as a synonym for resurrection life in the eschatology of the Fourth Gospel,[3] (2) the Johannine passages used for support are John 5:25 and 11:25f. Additionally, Charles and Dodd are agreed on the Platonic nature of this presently realized resurrection life, while Käsemann and Robinson are agreed in seeing the Gnostic view of the resurrection as a background for both the Pauline "eschatologische Vorbestehung," as well as the Johannine modifications of received sacramentalism.

In approaching a solution to this difficult problem, it might be well to begin with a few general observations. First of all, in the typological group of texts to which the Fourth Gospel belongs, there is no trace of a belief in the present realization of resurrection life with the exception of Marcion of Sinope.[4] There is positive

---

[1] *Ibid.*

[2] Some of these "others" include C. H. Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 148; Beasley-Murray, "The Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Apocalypse," p. 183; C. F. D. Moule, "The Individualism of the Fourth Gospel," p. 184: "It is a one-by-one salvation that is here envisaged. It could very easily give rise to that individualistic heresy alluded to in 2 Tim. ii 18—that the resurrection had already taken place."

[3] Since we must read the Fourth Gospel against a Jewish background, we must certainly agree with F. Büchsel that "für das echte Judentum ist das ewige Leben geknüpft an die Auferstehung der Toten" (*Johannes und der hellenistische Synkretismus* [Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1928], p. 55).

[4] Both H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, p. 114, and Böcher, *Der johanneische Dualismus*, pp. 120f., claim that the resurrection is a present factor in the experience of the Qumran sectarians (cf. *supra*, p. 32, n. 1). If this position is valid, we then have evidence for a pre-Christian belief in the present realization of resurrection existence. It is possible, though no one to my knowledge has yet advanced the thesis, that the interesting title of Simon Magus, "the standing one" (Greek: ὁ ἑστῶς; Hebrew: *haqqām*; Aramaic: *qā'ēm*), may be the Semitic way of claiming to be "the resurrected one" (cf. b. Sanhedrin 10.1; M. Gaster, *Samaritan Eschatology*, p. 107).

and overwhelming evidence that this was not a belief of Ignatius of Antioch,[1] and while this belief is absent from the Odes of Solomon, one cannot dogmatically state that it cannot have been held by the Odist and the community of which he was a part. On the other hand, the fact that belief in the present realization of resurrection existence was at home in Syria at a relatively early date in the teaching of Menander,[2] and in Asia Minor at the beginning of the second century, as reflected in both the Pastoral Letters of Pseudo-Paul (cf. II Tim. 2:18), and the Jewish Christian substratum of the theology of Marcion of Sinope, is certainly significant.[3] The probability of the Syro-Palestinian provenance of the Fourth Gospel underlines the importance as well as the relevance which early varieties of Christian belief in that area holds for a proper assessment of the Gospel. Secondly, belief in the present experience of resurrection existence frequently resulted in the pursuit of an ascetic mode of life (cf. I Tim. 4:1-5 in relation to II Tim. 2:18), or in a libertarian style of life (as in the case of the Corinthian adherents to gnosis). In the light of our investigation of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel, determined as it is by the current religious values and needs of the Johannine community, we would antecedently expect to find one of these two life-styles projected back into the life-style of the historical Jesus. Since neither of these two modes of life finds any expression in the depiction of the Johannine Jesus,[4] we may assume with a relatively high degree of probability that the realized character of resurrection existence was neither a primary nor a marginal mode of conceptualizing the present realization of eschatological salvation within the Johannine community. Let us now turn to a detailed discussion of the two crucial passages, John 5:25 and 11:25f.

In John 5:25 we find a logion referring both to the final resurrection ("the hour is coming"), as well as to the present situation in the life of Jesus, a situation which is continued on the in experience of the Johannine community ("and now is"): "Truly, truly, I say to you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live." The crucial questions which concern the correct interpretation of this passage

[1] *Infra*, pp. 152-159.

[2] Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 1. 17 (Harvey, I, 195); Tertullian *De anima* 50. 1; Ps.-Tertullian *Adv. omn. haer.* 1; Justin *I Apology* 26. 4.

[3] *Infra*, pp. 202-214.

[4] The only possible exception is John 4:31-34.

revolve about the proper assessment of the meaning of the terms "dead" (οἱ νεκροί), and "live" (ζήσουσιν). If "the dead" are interpreted to be the spiritually dead (as by most commentators [1]), then it must be conceded that the Fourth Gospel reflects at least a marginal emphasis upon the present realization of resurrection life. However, if "the dead" are viewed as the physically dead, then this passage cannot be used as evidence for the supposed Johannine belief in the realized resurrection.[2]

While Johannine literature certainly reflects the conception that unbelievers exist in the sphere of death (cf. John 5:24; I John 3:14), the word used is always θάνατος. However, the word meaning "the dead" in the Fourth Gospel (νεκρός), occurs eight times within the gospel,[3] and *always refers to the physically dead,* with the possible exception of the present passage, John 5:25. John 5:21, occurring in the same context as 5:25, reads: "as the Father raises the dead (τοὺς νεκρούς) and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whom he will." It would be most unlikely that "the dead" in 5:21 should be interpreted literally while "the dead" in 5:25 are interpreted figuratively. However, that is precisely what the great majority of commentators do.[4]

Another factor in John 5:25 which militates against interpreting "the dead" as the spiritually dead, is the fact that they are called to life by "hearing" the voice of the Son of God. As we have already observed,[5] the term "hearing" (οἱ ἀκούσαντες) is not used as a synonym for believing, and therefore cannot be interpreted as a decisive factor in the reception of eternal life unless it is coupled with a believing response. If "those who hear" in 5:25 subsequently

---

[1] Cf. Sanders and Mastin, *The Gospel According to St. John,* p. 168; Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John,* p. 218; Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes,* p. 195; Blank, *Krisis,* p. 142; J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John,* I (The International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928), 242; W. F. Howard, "The Gospel According to St. John," *The Interpreter's Bible,* ed. George Arthur Buttrick, *et al.,* VIII (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952), 547.

[2] Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel,* p. 209, and van Hartingsveld, *Die Eschatologie,* pp. 50-56, support the interpretation of "the dead" as the physically dead.

[3] John 2:22; 5:21, 25; 12:1, 9, 17; 20:9; 21:14.

[4] Sanders and Mastin, *The Gospel According to St. John,* p. 166; Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John,* p. 216; Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John,* I, 191; Bernard, *The Gospel According to St. John,* I, 240f.

[5] *Supra,* p. 111.

possess life, it can only be on the basis of a previous acceptance of the word of Jesus. Who can be in this position except believers who have already died? On the basis of all of these considerations, we are disposed to interpret "the dead" in John 5:25 as a reference to those who have physically died.

Further evidence for this position may be derived on analogy from our previous examination of the two member couplet in which the first member refers to the present time of decision and appropriation of the eschatological gift, while the second member refers to one's future eschatological destiny. In John 5:19-30 we have a wider application of the principle of eschatological polarization: 5:19-24 deals with the present appropriation of eternal life, while 5:25-30 deals primarily with the future results of present belief.[1] If we were to interpret' 'the dead" of 5:25 as the spiritually dead, then 5:25 would be essentially a parallel expression of 5:24. However, if we interpret "the dead" of 5:25 to mean the physically dead, the reason for the juxtaposition of present (5:24) with future (5:25) becomes obvious. John is moving from the present implications of belief to the future implications of belief. From this perspective, 5:25 is essentially parallel with 5:28f.:

> Do not marvel at this, for the hour is coming in which all those who are in the tombs will hear his voice, and they will come out, those who have done good to the resurrection of life, but those who have done evil to the resurrection of judgment.

What we find in these two passages reflects the Jewish exegetical principle *a minori ad maius*. "The dead" in 5:21, 25 are not all the dead, merely some of the dead.[2] All the dead are specifically meant in 5:28.

To what, then, does John 5:25 specifically refer? Within the context of the Fourth Gospel it refers to the resurrection of Lazarus, an event which demonstrates the presence of the messianic plenipotentiary of God. Within the setting of the Johannine community this logion continued to possess contemporary significance, since John 14:12 (referring to the "greater works" which the followers of Jesus will perform), can certainly refer to miraculous resuscita-

[1] Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, pp. 218-21 sees the same emphases in 5:19-24 and 5:25-30 as we have stated above, but regards 5:25-30 as a duplicate of 5:19-24 belonging to a later stage in the composition of the Fourth Gospel.

[2] Van Hartingsveld, *Die Eschatologie*, p. 48, claims that "*the* dead in 5:25 is a Semitism in which the article does not necessarily refer to the whole class generically (as would the use of the article generically in Greek).

tions which occurred within the experience of the community.[1] We can only conclude that John 5:25, in spite of the positions of many commentators on the Fourth Gospel, cannot refer to the experience of realized resurrection life.

In John 11:25f. we read: "I am the resurrection and the life; he who believes in me, though he dies, yet shall he live, and whoever lives and believes in me shall never die." This is the other passage which, in addition to John 5:25, is most frequently adduced to substantiate the theory that the Fourth Evangelist presents the resurrection as an experience which is capable of present realization. At first sight, it would seem that here resurrection is equivalent to or synonymous with life in the thought of the Fourth Evangelist.[2] While it is undeniable that both resurrection and life are closely related in this Johannine logion, the fact that both nouns retain their respective articles even though connected with καί reveals that they need not be considered identical or synonymous.[3]

The fact that the two main members of this Johannine pronouncement are apparently contradictory has provided commentators with an opportunity to propose a bewildering number of interpretations.[4] One of the more common solutions is to interpret the word "die" in the second member (11:26), in a figurative manner making it a reference to spiritual death, while the other occurences of the terms "live" and "die" in the passage are interpreted literally.

Van Hartingsveld's exegesis of John 11:25-26 is both careful and compelling.[5] Relating the passage closely to its context, he concludes that the phrase "the one who has faith in me, even though he dies" refers specifically to Lazarus. The second member, "the one who is alive and has faith in me will never die," has an immediate reference to Mary, Martha and their contemporaries. The resurrection of Lazarus must be understood as a special case

---

[1] Cf. Acts 9:36-43; 20:7-12; Mark 5:41f.; 9:26f.; Hebrews 11:35.

[2] This common view is disputed for dubious reasons by Ricca, *Die Eschatologie*, p. 127: "Die Auferstehung ist nicht identisch mit dem ewigen Leben; allerdings wird—und das ist das Wesentliche—gesagt, dass diese Identität in Christus schon erreicht ist (11,25). Das gegenwärtige ewige Leben und die endzeitliche Auferstehung sind zwei heilsgeschichtlich scharf unterschiedene Grössen; beide sind jedoch auf das gleiche *egō* Jesu bezogen."

[3] Nigel Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Vol. III: *Syntax* (Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 1963), pp. 181f.

[4] See the summary of views on this passage carefully assessed and presented by Brown, *The Gospel of John*, pp. 424f.

[5] Van Hartingsveld, *Die Eschatologie*, pp. 50-56.

of that which would become the general rule "on the last day," when the general resurrection of the dead would occur. The meaning of this passage for the Johannine community becomes clear when we compare it with an essentially similar statement of Paul in I Thessalonians 4:13-18. There those who have already died are expected to rise to new life at the occurrence of the Parousia, while those who are yet alive will enjoy the full benefits of the life of the age to come. In John 11:25-26, therefore, each occurrence of the terms "live" and "die" must be interpreted literally, thereby offering no support whatsoever to the contention that the Fourth Gospel contains a belief in the realized resurrection. We must therefore conclude that the view that the Fourth Evangelist teaches that resurrection existence is somehow realized in the present experience of believers is completely without exegetical foundation. This is corroborated by the similar absence of any evidence from the Gospel that the transformation which occurs through the "birth from above" is a metaphysical or ontological transformation, together with the absence of any indication that the life-style of the Johannine community was conceived as being either ascetically or libertarian oriented.

Judgment in the Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel

While the explicit purpose of the Fourth Gospel is to encourage belief in Jesus as the Messiah, and thereby provide those who respond in belief with the eschatological gift of eternal life, this very statement implies the opposite possibility. Those who do not believe, but reject the messianic status of Jesus receive a divine judgment which issues in death. The development of the plot of the Gospel bears out this inference, for the divine pronouncement of judgment attends the Jewish rejection of the person, message and works of Jesus. In fact, this Johannine emphasis upon judgment occupies such a prominent position in the Fourth Gospel that many students of the Gospel have viewed it as the central theme of Johannine theology.[1] The important position which this "judgment theology" occupies in the Fourth Gospel is directly related to the contemporary conflict and controversy with the Jewish community experienced by the Johannine church. This is substantiated by the fact that the term "judgment" (κρίσις)

[1] This is the position of Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 17; Bultmann, "Die Eschatologie des Johannesevangeliums," p. 139; *idem*, *New Testament Theology*, II, 33-69.

and its cognates occur almost exclusively in the first section of the Gospel, John 1:1-12:50, where the message of the Johannine Jesus is proclaimed to and rejected by the Israelite nation.

As in the case with the expression "eternal life," so "judgment" in the Fourth Gospel is an eschatological act which the Johannine community realizes has been decreed by God in the present time against all who reject the messianic status of Jesus. This present realization of eschatological judgment is clearly expressed in a number of passages, among them John 3:18:[1]

> The one who believes in him is not condemned,
> but the one does not believe is already condemned,
> because he has not believed in the name of the only Son of God.

The use of the perfect tense in the expression "has been judged/condemned" (κέκριται), together with the addition of the emphatic particle "already" (ἤδη), indicates that the moment an individual responds in a negative manner to the proclamation of the Johannine community, he is irrevocably condemned by God. In the following verse, John 3:19, this divine judgment upon those who reject the message of Jesus is broadened to include the entire world, a world which preferred darkness to light, and consequently tried unsuccessfully to exterminate the light (cf. John 1:5).[2] It is important to recognize the fact that the world is not judged because of its essential wickedness, but because it has willingly blinded itself to the light. Judgment is directly consequent upon a wrong decision, not upon the consequences of an inherently evil nature.

This divine judgment, which has already fallen upon the unsuspecting unbelievers, is not yet complete. This is borne out by John 12:48, a further example of the two-member Johannine eschatological pronouncement saying:

> He who rejects me and does not receive my sayings has a judge.
> The word which I have spoken will be his judge on the last day.

---

[1] The eschatological language of Romans 1:18 ("the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness"), underlines Paul's conception of a present realization of eschatological judgment. Cf. D. E. H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 66.

[2] Cf. Böcher, *Der johanneische Dualismus*, p. 99: "Insofern mit dem Anbruch dieses Lichtes die eschatologische Heilzeit Gegenwart geworden ist (I Joh 2, 8 'Die Finsternis ist im Vergehen, und das wirkliche Licht scheint schon'), gehören auch die johanneischen Aussagen über Licht und Finsternis zu den eschatologischen Texten des nachbiblisch-jüdischen Licht-Finsternis-Dualismus."

Through this passage we learn that an individual's relationship to Jesus in this life is completely determinative for his ultimate acceptance or rejection by God "on the last day." The significance of this logion within the theology of the Johannine community cannot be overlooked. Since they stand as the plenipotentiaries of the exalted Jesus, and through the agency of the Spirit-Paraclete continue the proclamation of the message of Jesus, performing the evidential signs which Jesus performed (but in an even greater measure), it is precisely in their contemporary situation that belief is rewarded with eternal life and unbelief is rewarded with judgment.

Once again we are reminded of the similarities of this Johannine pronouncement, together with the others already discussed, to the "statements of holy law" analyzed by Ernst Käsemann.[1] Käsemann characterized the earlier form of these two-member pronouncements of the *ius talionis* as consisting in a protasis and an apodasis. The protasis begins with the casuistic legal expression "if anyone" or "whoever," followed by the particular transgression envisaged. The apodasis, usually in the future tense, fits the punishment to the crime at the eschatological level. Finding examples of this Christian *ius talionis* in such New Testament passages as I Corinthians 3:17, 14:38 and Galatians 1:9, Käsemann thinks that a further example, Revelation 22:18f., reveals that the original setting for this eschatological *ius talionis* was prophetic proclamation. The lessening of prophetic enthusiasm in the church resulted in the transformation of this originally jussive sentence into a parenetic argument (cf. II Cor. 9:6; Rom. 2:12).[2]

---

[1] *Supra*, p. 110. It should perhaps be noted that Käsemann's analysis has been oversimplified in an unfortunate way by Norman Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* pp. 22f., 186. Perrin speaks of the "characteristic form" of these pronouncements as consisting in a two-part pronouncement with the same verb in both members, the first in the present tense, the second in the future tense. Käsemann nowhere speaks of a "characteristic form" of these statements of holy law, nor does he particularly stress the use of the same verb in both the protasis and apodasis.

[2] An unusually large number of examples of the *ius talionis* in the form of parenetic arguments may be found in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch. One of the characteristic rhetorical devices used by Ignatius is found in his frequent use of "statements of reciprocity," a literary form discussed by Robert M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers: A Translation and Commentary*, Vol. IV: *Ignatius of Antioch* (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1966), pp. 134f. These "statements of reciprocity" take the form of a couplet, with the same verb in each member. The first member refers to the action of man in the present, while the second member contains the response or

One of the statements of holy law discussed by Käsemann is Mark 8:38 (et par.):[1] "For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of man also be ashamed when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." Whether or not the essential content of this statement is viewed as an authentic utterance of Jesus, it would certainly seem to exhibit community formulation in its present state. If we accept Käsemann's hypothesis of the prophetic formulation of such pronouncements in a setting of enthusiastic eucharistic worship,[2] we then have a striking formal and material parallel to the Johannine pronouncements, both with respect to prophetic origin and cultic setting. The striking feature which Mark 8:38 has in common with John 12:48 (and other Johannine eschatological pronouncements), is the emphasis on the decisive nature of an individual's relationship to Jesus, a relationship which is completely determinative for his future destiny. In the period subsequent to the exaltation and glorification of Jesus, it is the Johannine community itself which constitutes the earthly representation of Jesus; the community itself functions as a *Christus prolongatus*. The kind of response which characterizes those who receive the divine message from the Johannine community is completely determinative for their own eschatological destiny.

Within the Fourth Gospel, emphasis is laid again and again on the fact that judgment is a divine prerogative which has been entrusted to the Son. This is particularly evident in the fifth chapter, where it is explicitly stated that the divine prerogatives

---

reciprocal action of God in the present or future. Examples include Smyrn. 9:1: "The one who honors the bishop has been honored," Philad. 10:1-2: "Glorify his name . . . and you yourselves will be glorified" (cf. Smyrn. 5:1; 9:2; Rom. 8:1; Eph. 2:1; 21:1).

[1] Käsemann, "Sätze heiligen Rechtes," pp. 78f.

[2] Several difficulties with Käsemann's analysis are noted by Robinson, "The Formal Structure of Jesus' Message," p. 98, n. 23. In an article entitled "The Ground of Christian Theology," *Journal for Theology and the Church*, VI (1969), 53, Gerhard Ebeling interrogatively expresses some criticism of Käsemann's hypothesis: "In addition, I should like to ask how far the apocalyptic forms of speech discovered by Käsemann—that is, specific patterns of juristic, proclamatory, or parenetic speech with a background of apocalyptic motifs, or what should then be called apocalyptico-prophetic forms of speech—are to be found also in late Judaism and how fair it is a case of new creations on the part of Christianity." For a critical consideration and rejection of Käsemann's hypothesis see Klaus Berger, "Zu den sogenannten Sätze heiligen Rechts," *New Testament Studies*, XXVII (1970), 10-40.

of giving life and judging have been delegated to the Son.[1] We read in John 5:22f.: "The Father judges no one, but has given all judgment to the Son, that all may honor the Son even as they honor the Father." This idea is further elaborated in 5:27: "[The Father] has given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man." In the light of this latter passage, we are led to the conclusion that the Johannine judgment theology is inextricably bound up with the Johannine depiction of Jesus as the Son of man.[2] It would not be an inaccurate generalization to say that, unlike the synoptic depiction of Jesus as the Son of man,[3] the Johannine Son of man is almost completely defined by his eschatological function.[4] Jesus' position as the bestower of life (6:27), and as judge (5:27), are grounded in the fact that he is the Son of man. It is therefore not surprising when this Christological title recurs in contexts in which the judgment motif is elaborated (3:14-21; 5:22-27; 9:35-41; 12:20-36).[5] In the Johannine view, the Son of man is to be equated with the Messiah (cf. 12:34), who, in his eschatological capacity is both a giver of life as well as a judge.

Since the gift of eternal life is predicated upon the "exaltation" or "lifting up" of the Son of man (3:15), thereby placing the Son of man in the position of giver of life and salvation, he assumes a function which he did not exercise in late Jewish eschatology.[6] The present realization of judgment as well as eternal life must be viewed against the background of Jewish apocalyptic in which judgment was anticipated as an event which would occur prior to the bestowal of the gift of salvation.[7] The real emphasis of the Fourth Gospel, however, is not on judgment, but rather on the eschatological gift of eternal life. In the words of Blank, "Since faith rests on the free decision of man, the possibility of unbelief is also given, and therefore the possibility also exists of coming into judgment."[8] Therefore the function of the Son as judge is little more than the compliment to his function as bestower of life.[9]

---

[1] Cf. Dodd, *Interpretation*, pp. 320-28, where he discusses the Jewish conceptions of "giving life" and "judging" as the two perpetual activities of God.

[2] There is an excellent discussion of the term Son of man in the Fourth Gospel together with an exegesis of each of the contexts in which the term appears in Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man*, pp. 153-84.

[3] Cf. Bultmann's three-fold division of the Son of man sayings (as coming, as suffering, dying and rising, as now at work) in *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 150ff., and *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 30.

[4] Schulz, *Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie*, pp. 179f.

[5] Ricca, *Die Eschatologie*, pp. 96f.

[6] Blank, *Krisis*, p. 85. [7] *Ibid.*, pp. 89ff. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 131. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 160.

In conclusion, it must be said that the ministry of judgment, as the ministry of bestowing life, is not to be thought of as an exercise of divine authority limited to the historical Jesus. This is particularly clear in John 3:13-17, where both elements are found in a context which presupposes the descent and ascent of Jesus as factors in the historical past. Both elements of realized eschatology—the pronouncement of judgment and salvation—have their locus in the worship, preaching and teaching of that community and their legitimation in the pneumatic continuation of the eschatological ministry of the Son of man.

The "Coming" of Jesus in Johannine Eschatology

On the basis of a number of important passages within the Fourth Gospel taken together with numerous parallels from other documents of early Christianity, we have set forth the hypothesis of the cultic vision of the exalted Jesus.[1] This cultic "coming" of the Son of man to save and to judge, to bless and to curse was a corporate worship experience which the Johannine community conceptualized in terms of the traditional Christian expectation of the Parousia. During the course of that discussion we did little more than allude to the significance of the references to Jesus' "coming" in the Farewell Discourses of the Fourth Gospel. At this juncture we shall attempt to substantiate our hypothesis of the cultic vision of the exalted Jesus by demonstrating that the "coming" referred to in the Farewell Discourses was an integral element to the recurring cultic vision of Jesus.

The "coming" of Jesus is frequently mentioned in John 13-17, the so-called Farewell Discourses of the Johannine Jesus. The verb "to come" (ἔρχεσθαι) is found twenty-four times in these chapters, with an extremely wide variety of meanings and applications. It can refer to the Incarnation of Jesus (15:22; 16:27f., 30),[2] his departure to the Father (17:11, 13), the coming of a future eschatological event (16:2, 4, 13, 25, 32; 17:1), the coming of the Spirit-Paraclete (15:26; 16:7f., 13), the coming of "the ruler of this world" (14:30), and the coming of the disciples to the Father (14:6).

All of these uses of the verb "to come" are fairly clear and

[1] *Supra*, pp. 89-102.

[2] Outside of the Farewell Discourse, the verb ἔρχεσθαι is used of the Incarnation of Jesus in 1:9, 11; 3:2, 19, 31; 6:14; 7:28; 8:14, 42; 9:39; 12:47; 13:3; 18:37. The term καταβαίνειν is also used of the Incarnation in 3:13; 6:33, 38, 50, 51, 58.

easy to interpret, with the possible exception of the last. However, when we come to the passages which speak of the "coming" of Jesus (in one instance, 14:23, the coming of the Father and the Son is spoken of jointly), the exegetical and interpretive task becomes quite difficult. Passages which refer to the coming of Jesus (excluding the Incarnation and departure to the Father), include John 14:3, 18, 23 and 28. These passages have been frequently adduced in support of the contention that the Fourth Evangelist has "spiritualized" or "demythologized" the Parousia hope of early Christianity.

The use of the verb ἔρχεσθαι in the First Letter of John has some similarity to its use in the Fourth Gospel. The term can refer to the Incarnation of Jesus (4:2; 5:6, 20; cf. II John 7), and to the coming of eschatological events (2:18). However, the term παρουσία is used for the expected return of Jesus in 2:28, while the verb φανεροῦν ("to appear, be manifest") is used of this event in 3:2. The evidence from the First Letter of John, then, gives us no substantial clue to the meaning of ἔρχεσθαι with Jesus as subject in John 14:3, 18, 23 and 28, apart from the possibility that a literal Parousia may be excluded.

In the Apocalypse of John we find an interesting phenomenon which has been pointed out by G. R. Beasley-Murray. Aside from the uses of ἔρχεσθαι which obviously refer to the Parousia (3:11; 16:15; 22:7, 12, 20), another "coming" of Jesus is referred to in the letter to the church at Ephesus (2:5), as well as in the letter to the Pergamene church (2:16). The first reference reads, "Remember then from what you have fallen, repent and do the works you did at first. If not, I will come to you (ἔρχομαί[1] σοι) and remove your lampstand from its place unless you repent." Similarly, in 2:16 we read, "Repent, then. If not, I will come to you (ἔρχομαί σοι) soon and war against them with the sword of my mouth." These anticipated "comings" of Jesus cannot, of course, be identified with the Parousia. Rather, they must be understood as "comings" which might well become an aspect of the present experience of the communities to which the warnings are directed. The imagery is manifestly that of the final and future Parousia of the Son of man, but the context demands that this "coming" be interpreted as a coming in judgment which is both antecedent to and the presupposition of the final glorious return of the Son of man.

[1] *Supra*, p. 111, n. 1.

The problem of determining precisely what is meant by the "coming" of Jesus in John 14 is compounded by the enigmatical use of two synonyms for the verb "to see" (θεωρεῖν and ὄψεσθαι), in a way which is closely related to the coming of Jesus. There are four of these problematic passages: (1) John 14:19: "Yet a little while and the world will see (θεωρεῖ) me no longer, but you will see (θεωρεῖτε) me; because I live you will live also." (2) John 16:10: "I go to the Father and you will see (θεωρεῖτε) me no more." (3) John 16:16: "A little while, and you will see (θεωρεῖτε) me no more; again a little while and you will see (ὄψεσθε) me." (4) John 16:22: "I will see (ὄψομαι) you again and your hearts will rejoice." It is quite evident that the Fourth Evangelist was fully aware of the enigmatical nature of these sayings, because of their use in a favorite literary device, the motif of misunderstanding. Then too, the logion of 16:16 ("A little while and you will see me no longer; again a little while and you will see me.") is repeated twice more (16:17, 19). The self-consciously enigmatical nature of these sayings is also reflected by the Evangelist in 16:25: "I have said this to you in figures; the hour is coming when I shall no longer speak to you in figures, but tell you plainly of the Father." We must conclude by affirming the necessity of interpreting the sayings related to the "coming" of Jesus (14:3, 18, 23, 28), in a way which closely relates to the sayings which speak of the disciples "seeing" Jesus (14:19, 16:10; 16, 17, 19, 22).

Some of the ways in which exegesis has sought to interpret the "coming" of Jesus in some or all of the above-mentioned passages are these: [1] (1) as resurrection appearances of Jesus, (2) as the coming of Jesus in the person of the Spirit-Paraclete, (3) as the coming of Jesus to individual disciples at the time of their death, (4) as the coming of Jesus to Christian martyrs in the hour of death, (5) as the Parousia of Jesus, and (6) as the "Heimholung der Jünger." [2] The interpretation which we prefer within the context of the present discussion has little in common with any of the

[1] In an article entitled "The Return of Christ," *The Early Church*, trans. A. J. B. Higgins (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966), pp. 154f., n. 13, Oscar Cullmann discusses three modes of the Lord's return found in the Gospel of John: (1) as the risen one, (2) in the Paraclete, and (3) at the end of time.

[2] This last possibility is found advocated by van Hartingsveld, *Die Eschatologie*, pp. 132ff., 145f. It is an event experienced within the lifetime of the disciples, but not identified with the Parousia.

alternatives listed. In our opinion, the "coming" of Jesus in the relevant passages under discussion from John 14 refers primarily to the recurring cultic "coming" of Jesus in the form of a pneumatic or prophetic *visio Christi* within the setting of worship "in the Spirit" as celebrated by the Johannine community. The eucharist undoubtedly forms the central moment of this setting within the cultic worship of the community in which the exalted Jesus, now present in Parousia splendor, pronounces both blessing and woe, salvation and judgment through prophetic cult personnel.[1] This position will be further clarified through the exegesis of the relevant passages from the Fourth Gospel.

In John 14:3 we read, "And when I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will take you to myself, that where I am, there you may be also." If we take the second person plural pronouns seriously, the possibility of interpreting this passage in terms of an individualized Parousia becomes antecedently impossible. The passage refers, with sufficient clarity, to a final eschatological return of Jesus for his followers in order that they may ascend to the heavenly realm with him where they will eternally contemplate his protological glory (cf. 12:26; 17:24). This apocalyptic return of Jesus is referred to in Johannine literature only here, John 21:22f., I John 2:28, and 3:2, and is supported by the opinions of a number of commentators.[2] Westcott interprets Jesus' "coming" in this passage to encompass all the comings imaginable, the Parousia, Pentecost, to the individual upon conversion and/or death.[3] Sanders and Mastin think the passage refers to the coming of the Paraclete,[4] while Bultmann,[5] Kundsin[6] and Bauer[7] refer the passage to the coming of Jesus in the hour of a believer's death. Dodd finds the traditional language of Christian eschatology

[1] Dodd, *Parables*, p. 164, n. 1, has called attention to some survivals of realized eschatology in the Eastern Rite. In the Cherubic Hymn in the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom we find the prayer "that we may receive the King of all, invisible escorted by the Angelic Hosts" preparing for the *sursum corda*, and culminating in the announcement of the coming of the Son of man.

[2] Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, p. 382; Bernard, *The Gospel According to St. John*, II, 534; Howard, "The Gospel According to St. John," p. 700; Ricca, *Die Eschatologie*, pp. 161f.

[3] Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John*, II, 168.

[4] Sanders and Mastin, *The Gospel According to St. John*, p. 321.

[5] Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 465, n. 1.

[6] Kundsin, "Die Wiederkunft Jesu," p. 213.

[7] Bauer, *Johannes*, p. 135.

echoed more strongly in John 14:3 than elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel,[1] but interprets the passage to mean that

> after the death of Jesus, and because of it, His followers will enter into union with Him as their living Lord, and through Him with the Father, and so enter into eternal life.[2]

The imagery of John 14:2 is important for our understanding of John 14:23, since the term μοναί ("dwellings") is closely connected with the verb ἔρχεσθαι, and the singular form of the same word, μονή ("dwelling") is found in 14:23 in a context which also connects it very closely with the verb ἔρχεσθαι. In view of the rarity of the term (found only in these two Johannine passages and nowhere else in the literature of the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers), the importance of their correct interpretation in these two significant passages is underlined.

In John 14:2 we read, "In my Father's οἰκίᾳ are many μοναί." Here οἰκία (a synonym of οἶκος) obviously refers to God's heavenly dwelling or temple.[3] This image is based on an assumption common to many of the world's religions that God's heavenly dwelling is really a grander version of his earthly dwelling.[4] Related to the Old Testament expression οἶκος Θεοῦ ("house of God"), a term used interchangeably with οἰκία in the Septuagint,[5] is the early Christian use of οἶκος as an image for the Christian community (cf. I Pet. 2:5; 4:17; I Tim. 3:15; Heb. 3:2-6).[6] It is probable that in John 14:2 (and also 8:35), the term οἰκία (τοῦ πατρός) reflects the self-designation of the Johannine community. Privately owned homes were frequently (and to begin with, exclusively) the setting for the worship of early Christian communities.[7] This is also the case in Johannine literature as II John 10 reveals: "If anyone comes to you (ὑμᾶς) and does not bring this doctrine, do

---

[1] Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 404.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 405.

[3] Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, p. 381. Cf. II Cor. 5:1, "οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἔχομεν οἰκίαν ἀχειροποίητον αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς" Here οἰκία must refer, not to individual bodies, but to the heavenly temple, as the present tense of ἔχομεν necessitates; cf. E. Earle Ellis, "The Structure of Pauline Eschatology," *Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961), p. 41.

[4] *Supra*, pp. 19f.

[5] O. Michel, "*Oikos*, etc.," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, V, 131.

[6] *Ibid.*, V, 125-28.

[7] Cf. Acts 2:46; 5:42; 20:20; Rom. 16:5; I Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phile. 2.

not receive him into the house (εἰς οἰκίαν) or give him any greeting." Here the Elder is addressing a small Christian community meeting for worship in a private home. The conditional clause is the type in which the condition stated in the protasis is assumed as real, and the protasis should therefore be translated "*when* someone comes to you." This points out the official and customary nature of the "coming" of an itinerant prophet or teacher such as those described in the Didache. The Christophanic significance of these charismatics for the communities in which they ministered is revealed by the fact that they are to be regarded "as the Lord" (Did. 4:1f.; 11:1f.).

In the light of John 14:23 ("we will come to him and make our dwelling with him"), we must interpret μονή in the singular as an individual believer who is the locus for the pneumatic indwelling of the Father and the Son. However, just as the heavenly οἰκία has many μοναί (14:2), so the earthly οἰκία, or church, contains many μοναί, or individuals in whom God dwells. The indwelling of the divine persons in the individual μονή is derivative in the sense that the fulness of the divine presence is coextensive with the οἰκία, whether considered in its heavenly or earthly dimension. While the emphasis in John 14:23 is certainly on individual salvation,[1] the communal orientation of this salvation is presupposed.

If we take John 14:3 on its own terms and relate it to the eternal destiny of Jesus' followers (cf. 12:26; 17:24), then it is mandatory that we view this "coming" as an actual reference to the future Parousia hope which is more clearly expressed in John 21:22f.; I John 2:28 and 3:2. The significance of 14:23 is that it clearly points out another kind of "coming" which excludes the gathering of Jesus' followers, but is nevertheless closely related to the "coming" of 14:3. To anticipate the results of our interpretation of the other relevant passages, it would seem that John 14:23 contains a reference to the cultic "coming" of Jesus, either in personal and realistic vision-form or Christophany, or through the prophetic agency of charismatic leaders (such as the itinerant prophets of the Didache, who are to be received "as the Lord"), as an experience of the future Parousia in the present moment of the cult.

John 14:18-20 contains a number of important clues for the solution of the problem of the meaning of the "coming" passages:

[1] Moule ,"The Individualism of the Fourth Gospel," p. 172; F. Hauck, "*Menō*, etc.," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, IV, 580.

> I will not leave you desolate, I will come to you. Yet a little while, and the world will see me no more, but you will see me. Because I live, you will live also. In that day you will know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you.

We should note first of all that this "coming" of Jesus is equated with a "seeing" of him by his disciples, a "seeing" which excludes those who live in the sphere of the world, i.e., those who have not been assimilated to the heavenly mode of existence inaugurated by the "birth from above." The Parousia is certainly not in view at this point, since it is primarily conceived of as a public event.[1] The Evangelist, for his own reasons, is describing the "coming" and "seeing" of Jesus in language reminiscent of the Parousia tradition. When we inquire into the possible reasons why he has seen fit to do this, it becomes immediately apparent that it is precisely because both kinds of "coming" and "seeing" are closely connected, so closely connected that the Parousia and the "coming" and "seeing" about which he is presently speaking have no valid independent existence without the other. In response to the statement in 14:20 ("In that day you will know that I am in my Father," etc.), we must respond, *Why* will the disciples know this? The answer can only be that the recognition of who Jesus really is will somehow become crystal clear upon the event of his "coming" and being "seen." During the earthly life of Jesus, his glory was visible only to eyes of faith. What new context can we envision in which the glory of Jesus, i.e., his messianic status, becomes supremely self-evident to the beholder(s)? Only a vision and/or audition of the exalted Jesus in his messianic splendor can provide the individual with unequivocal evidence of the present status of Jesus.

John 16:10, 16, 17, 19 and 22 are all interrelated. This is made abundantly clear by the allusion in 16:16 to 16:10, and the quotation of 16:16 in 16:17 and 19. At first glance the statement made in 16:16 is contradictory: "A little while and you will see (θεωρεῖτε) me no more; again a little while and you will see (ὄψεσθε) me." That these two kinds of sight are contradictory is clearly revealed by the emphatic phrase from the first line, οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτε ("you will

---

[1] Cf. Rev. 1:7: "Behold he is coming with the clouds, and every eye will see him." The fact that the public nature of the Parousia is presupposed by the Fourth Evangelist is made clear through the question of Judas in 14:22: "How is it that you will manifest yourself to us and not to the world?"

no longer see me"), as well as from the dialogue which ensues between Jesus and his disciples. The emphasis on the fact that the disciples "will no longer see" Jesus is a consequence of his ascension to his Father (16:10). We must now ask what kind of sight is meant in the second line, "again a little while and you will see (ὄψεσθε) me."

While the total usage of the various synonyms for the verb "to see" in the Fourth Gospels reveals no clear distinction between the shades of meaning in the various Greek verbs used,[1] some distinctions may be traced in individual contexts. While θεωρεῖν in John 16:16 refers to actual sight, something other than physical sight must be meant by ὄψεσθαι. In our exegesis of John 1:51 we pointed out the fact that ὄψεσθαι is drawn from the Parousia imagery and terminology associated with the combination of Daniel 7:13 with Psalm 110:1 and Zechariah 12:10f. The "seeing" referred to in John 16:16b is therefore in all probability a reference to the cultic perception of the exalted Jesus in which the actual pneumatic experience of a cultic Christophany is clothed in the language and imagery of conventional theophanic and Parousia forms. We must therefore conclude that the enigmatical references to the "coming" and "seeing" of Jesus derive from the pneumatic cultic experience of the presence of the exalted Jesus in the midst of the worshipping community, a presence which is conceptualized in the language and imagery traditionally reserved for the description of the Parousia hope of early Christianity.

Conclusions

In the foregoing study we have attempted to demonstrate that the crux of the problem created by the emphatic Johannine emphasis on realized eschatology is the necessity of understanding the meaning which that eschatology had for the community, the function which it had within their religious thought, and the mode or modes of conceptualization which enabled the Johannine community to experience aspects of eschatological salvation in the present.

---

[1] Bernard, *The Gospel According to St. John*, I, 67: "*optomai* . . . is always used in Jn. (3.36; 11.40; 16.16; I Jn. 3.2) of the vision of heavenly or spiritual realities, as distinct from a seeing with the eyes of the body." However beneficial this conclusion might be for the present study, we must regard Bernard's conclusions with a healthy dose of scepticism in view of the survey of such theories by Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, pp. 501-3.

The meaning and function of realized eschatology are closely connected, in that the experience of the present realization of eschatology is the primary way in which the Johannine community knew itself to be the corporate earthly representative of the exalted Jesus, constituted through the possession of his *alter ego*, the Spirit-Paraclete. Since their communal and individual self-conception was virtually identical with that of the Johannine Jesus, it was by virtue of their present possession of eschatological life and their ability to pronounce judgment upon those who rejected their proclamation that this soteriologically relevant identification and unity with the exalted Jesus was based.

The mode whereby eschatological salvation was realized within the community was at once less than an ontological transformation and more than an ethical transformation of individual believers. It was less than an ontological transformation since the individual believer only possessed the divine gift of eschatological life as he maintained a dynamic relationship to the community through which that life was dispensed, and through which it flowed. It was more than an ethical transformation since the believer was an actual participant in the divine life mediated through the exalted Jesus to his earthly *alter ego*, the Christian community. Life was therefore a sphere of eschatological existence into which the believer was transferred, a sphere which was coextensive with the empirical Christian community, a community which was cultically defined and pneumatically endowed.

Before the exaltation of the earthly Jesus, the possession of life and the ability to judge were limited to his person. Subsequent to this exaltation and the consequent bestowal of the Spirit-Paraclete to the community, the possession of life and the authority to pronounce divine judgment became coextensive with the empirical community through whose agency the presence of the exalted Jesus continued on in the world. While the soteriological significance of church order and discipline is absent from the Fourth Gospel (unlike the Letters of Ignatius), such an ingredient if it were present would not contradict, but rather compliment the basic movement of Johannine thought.

The cultic "coming" of the exalted Jesus, conceived either as a direct visionary experience within the context of worship, or as a presence mediated through the agency of prophetic individuals who spoke in the name and with the full authority of their exalted

Lord, was stereotyped through the use of motifs from traditional Christian Parousia traditions. It was this cultic experience of the direct or mediated presence of the exalted Jesus which provided the basis for the retrojection of similar characteristics into the life of the Johannine Jesus. Since the Johannine Jesus possessed the gift of eschatological life, so did the Johannine community. Since the Johannine Jesus was endued with the authority to pronounce proleptic judgment upon those who rejected his message, so the Johannine community was enabled to pronounce judgment upon those who rejected their message. The Jesus of the Fourth Gospel is depicted as the dispenser of eschatological life and judgment because that is the primary way in which he was experienced within a cultic setting by the community.

CHAPTER IV

THE PRESENT REALIZATION OF ESCHATOLOGICAL SALVATION IN THE LETTERS OF IGNATIUS

Introduction to the Problem

The seven genuine letters of Ignatius of Antioch were all written within the span of a very few weeks under conditions of exceptional physical and emotional strain. Their author was being taken from Syria to Rome by a Roman cohort for the purpose of execution. Since the martyrdom of Ignatius occured in all probability during the latter part of the reign of Trajan (A. D. 98-117), the extant collection of letters constitutes an important source of information regarding the history of Christianity in Antioch and Asia Minor shortly after the turn of the first century. Ignatius mentions Paul twice by name (Eph. 12:2; Rom. 4:3), and betrays a knowledge of the collection of Pauline letters through verbal allusion and stylistic imitation.[1] Although one might antecedently expect a

[1] Eduard von der Goltz, *Ignatius von Antiochien als Christ und Theologe* (Texte und Untersuchungen, Bd. 12; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1894), pp. 99-118. On pp. 178-84, von der Goltz has tables of parallels between the Pauline corpus and the Ignatian letters. For a more recent discussion of Ignatius' dependence on Paul, see Robert M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers: A Translation and Commentary*, Vol. I: *An Introduction* (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1964), pp. 57-9; *idem*, *The Formation of the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965), pp. 89-97; cf. Heinrich Rathke, *Ignatius von Antiochien und die Paulusbriefe* (Texte und Untersuchungen, Bd. 99; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967). In an article entitled "Paulus in der griechischen Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LXXV (1964), 1-20, W. Schneemelcher has argued that Ignatius did not have a first-hand acquaintance with any of the Pauline letters. Schneemelcher attempts to prove (1) that Ignatius' supposed familiarity with Paul is a formal claim without material support due to erroneous statements which Ignatus makes about Paul, (2) that the inexactness of supposed citations from Paul militates against viewing them as quotations, and (3) that a summary of the peculiar theological emphases of Paul, when compared with Ignatius, reveals their essential theological independence. What Schneemelcher has actually proven is that Ignatius has misunderstood Paul (certainly a favorite second century pastime). In the words of Helmut Koester, "Man wird auch nicht überbetonen dürfen, dass bei Ign. literarische Kenntnis und sachliches Missverstehen immer Hand in Hand gehen" ("Geschichte und Kultus im Johannesevangelium und bei Ignatius von Antiochien," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, LIV [1957], 57).

similar mention of the name John, since one of the letters was addressed to the Ephesian church at a time well within a generation after the Gospel and Letters of John were composed, such is not the case. Similarly, there is no conclusive evidence that Ignatius even knew the Fourth Gospel,[1] although his theology and language seem to have a "Johannine ring." [2] Whether or not Ignatius knew the Fourth Gospel, there seems to be little doubt that both shared essentially the same religious, historical and cultural milieu.

In Rudolf Bultmann's treatment of the theology of the New Testament, the theologies of Paul and John are singled out as expressing the proper Christian understanding of human existence.[3] Developments antecedent to Paul are categorized as "Presupposi-

---

[1] J. N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church: Its Origin and Influence on Christian Theology up to Irenaeus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943), p. 14: "Nothing in these passages [i.e., those passages which reportedly have a "Johannine ring": Eph. 11:1; Magn. 6:1; 7:1; 8:2; Rom. 7:2; Philad. 7:1; 9:1] proves conclusively that Ignatius knew or used the Fourth Gospel as we have it, but it seems clear that there is a fairly close affinity between his theology and language and those of the Fourth Gospel." Cf. Robert M. Grant, "The Fourth Gospel and the Church," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXXV (1942), 98: "But there is no possible quotation from the Fourth Gospel itself [in the letters of Ignatius], and it must be above all noted that in the supreme instance where he could best have quoted the Fourth Gospel (in the third chapter of his letter to the Smyrnaeans, a congregation whose relations with John in Acta Iohannis are close) in proof of the risen Christ's being 'no bodiless demon,' he relied instead on a gospel which was to be left out of the canon!" On the other hand, both C. Maurer, *Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium* (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1949), and F.-M. Braun, *Jean le Théologien et son Évangile dans l'Église ancienne*, I (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1959), 262-82, think that Ignatius both knew and used the Fourth Gospel. Their literary relationship continues to remain uncertain.

[2] Johannes Weiss, *Earliest Christianity*, trans. F. C. Grant, *et al.*, II (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1959), 773.

[3] This is not only evident from the structure of the work taken as a whole (the section on Johannine theology is placed immediately after that on Paul, certainly not on the basis of historical factors), but also by the use of Paul and John as explicit standards against which the Christian understanding of existence expressed in late New Testament literature and the literature of the early post-apostolic age is judged (Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, II, 155-202). Cf. the illuminating statement on p. 203 of volume II: "The problem [of Christian living] therefore resolves itself into this question: how is the relation between the present and the future, between the indicative and the imperative understood? Paul had solved the problem by his understanding of Christian freedom and had conceived the relation between the present and the future as a dialectic one—and John likewise. The question was whether or not this understanding would be retained . . ."

tions and Motifs of New Testament Theology,"[1] while the section after Bultmann's treatment of the theology of the Gospel and Letters of John ("The Development Toward the Ancient Church") [2] might well be given the appropriate sub-title "The Decline and Fall of the Proper Christian Understanding of Human Existence." [3] The one exception which Bultmann sees in this general trend of the breakdown of the proper understanding of the dialectical relationship between the present reality and ultimate futurity of salvation is the theology of Ignatius of Antioch. Ignatius, according to Bultmann, stands virtually alone as a theological heir to the paradoxical understanding of Christian existence reached by Paul and John.[4]

In the following study, we will be concerned primarily with testing the view of Bultmann and others [5] that Ignatius held a paradoxical juxtaposition of the present and future aspects of eschatological salvation. In anticipation of the conclusion of our investigation, let us state at the outset that there is no substantial evidence that Ignatius considered eschatological salvation to be a reality present in his own individual experience in any other than a radically con-

[1] See the table of contents, *Ibid.*, I, vii.

[2] *Ibid.*, II, v.

[3] Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament*, p. 290, has recognized the non-historical motivation of Bultmann's arrangement: "If we begin from Paul, we shall have to measure post-Pauline theology by Paul's doctrine of justification. Here the danger of an unhistorical assessment is not easily avoided. It must be kept in mind that the doctrine of justification is itself a *historical* criterion. It cannot be applied simply as a theoretical standard for distinguishing between good and bad theology, between proper belief and heresy." Conzelmann has therefore placed a section entitled "Development After Paul" before his treatment of Johannine theology. This partially fulfills his stated intention (p. xv), that he intends to give prominence to the historical components of the thought of Paul and John in contrast to Bultmann's existentialist interpretation.

[4] Bultmann's view that Ignatius maintains a tension between the present and future aspects of salvation in a manner not unlike Paul and John is expressed in his *Theology of the New Testament*, II, 191-99, but with greater force in his influential article "Ignatius und Paulus," *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii* (Haarlem: Erven F. Bohn, 1953), pp. 37-51.

[5] Cf. J. G. Davies, *The Early Christian Church* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1967), p. 131f.: "Despite the prospect of his own near death, Ignatius was confident that salvation is a present possession and not merely an object of hope." He bases this statement on Eph. 19 and Philad. 9. However, it is one thing to say that Jesus has achieved immortality for the church and quite another to say that it is the present experience or possession of an individual such as Ignatius.

ditional way. The ensuing discussion will be divided into three sections. First of all, we shall discuss the conception of the gospel held by Ignatius, secondly his views on the ways in which the salvific benefits of the gospel could be appropriated, and finally, his views on the nature and significance of eschatological salvation.

Ignatius' Conception of the Gospel

Ignatius considered the gospel to be the person and work of Jesus Christ (Philad. 5:2;[1] 8:2). Christology and soteriology are therefore interrelated to a degree comparable only to the theologies of Paul and John. Ignatius frequently expressed the gospel in terms of traditional creedal formulae which contain references to the Incarnation, Passion and Resurrection of Jesus (cf. Philad. 9:2; Magn. 11:1).[2] The anti-heretical context of many of these creedal statements shows that they were used to stress the historical reality of the gospel events in opposition to docetism. Those who deny the central affirmations of the gospel are automatically excluded from the sphere of faith (Magn. 5:2; Trall. 10:1; Smyrn. 2:1; 5:3). Ignatius often augments these three basic gospel events with other elements which emphasize either the humanity or the historicity of the earthly life of Jesus.[3]

[1] Walter Bauer, "Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia," *Die apostolischen Väter* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Ergänzungsband; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923), p. 258. Here Bauer emphasizes the parallel expressions εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον and εἰς αὐτόν (i.e., Jesus Christ) in Philad. 5:2. This equivalence is expressed more imaginatively in Philad. 9:2 where Ignatius uses a figure reminiscent of the Fourth Gospel in describing Christ as the door through which Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the prophets, the apostles and the Church enter.

[2] These essential elements of the gospel are mentioned again and again by Ignatius in various combinations: the Incarnation is emphasized in Eph. 7:2; 18:2; 19:1; 20:2; Trall. 9:1; Smyrn. 1:1, the Passion and Resurrection are stressed in Eph. 20:1; Philad. inscr.; 8:2; Smyrn. 1:2; 2:1; 7:1-2; 12:2, the Passion alone in Eph. 7:2; 16:1; 18:1-2; 19:1-2. Magn. 5:2; 9:1; Trall. inscr.; 2:1; 9:1; 10:1; 11:2; Rom. 6:3; 7:2; Philad. 3:3; 8:2; Smyrn. 1:1; 5:3, and the Resurrection alone in Smyrn. 3:1, 3

[3] Ignatius mentions Jesus' Davidic ancestry (Eph. 18:2; 20:2; Trall. 9:1; Rom. 7:3; Smyrn. 1:1), his birth of the virgin Mary (Eph. 7:2; 18:2; 19:1; Trall. 9:1; Smyrn. 1:1), the fact that he ate and drank as a man (Trall. 9:1), his baptism by John (Eph. 18:2; Smyrn. 1:1), and his suffering and death under Herod and/or Pilate (Magn. 11:1; Trall. 9:1; Smyrn. 1:2). Another form which Ignatius uses less frequently to state the essential content of the gospel is the creedal paradox such as we find in Eph. 7:2 (cf. Polyc. 3:2; Smyrn. 12:2). On this see Robert M. Grant, *The Early Christian Doctrine of God* (Charlottesville, Virginia: University Press of

Although Ignatius phrases these creedal affirmations in traditional terms, they are far from being merely otiose survivals in his theological vocabulary. Each Christological affirmation has positive soteriological significance. The Incarnation, for example, was a union of flesh and spirit which enabled Jesus to introduce eternal life to the world of man (Eph. 19:1-3). When this union of flesh and spirit is reproduced in man, he becomes enabled to appropriate the gift of immortality (Magn. 1:2; Smyrn. 3:2; Trall. inscr.; Philad. 4:1). Again, Ignatius regarded his own suffering as a demonstration of the reality of the Passion of Jesus, apart from which there could be no true salvation (Trall. 10:1; Smyrn. 4:2; 5:1).[1] From this we may deduce that the great antipathy which Ignatius felt with regard to docetism was grounded in piety; the sufferings of Jesus Christ had to be real because the sufferings of Ignatius were real. The significance of the "new man" Jesus Christ was the subject of a projected treatise by Ignatius which was unfortunately never completed (Eph. 20:1). In it he proposed to treat the divine plan "concerning the new man Jesus Christ, dealing with his faith and his love, his suffering and his resurrection." The probable thesis of this intended treatise was the paradigmatic value of the life and death of Jesus for the individual Christian within the framework of the local Christian community. In all of these creedal assertions, we have a vital relationship to the way or ways in which the benefits of salvation were conceptualized by Ignatius and his contemporaries.

Virginia, 1966), pp. 14-15. Grant emphasizes the fact that Christians made use of the current language of Greek philosophical theology at least by the time of Ignatius. The antithetical structure of these creeds reflects the influence of the popular rhetoric of the diatribe which (it so happens), is a strong feature of Ignatius' own style. Othmar Perler cites Eph. 7:2 as an example of the preference of Asianic rhetoric for short parallel or antithetic phrases ("Das vierte Makkabäerbuch, Ignatius von Antiochien und die ältesten Martyrerberichte," *Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana*, XXV [1949], 58). There seems little reason, therefore, for Helmut Koester to characterize Eph. 7:2 as "dualistic" and on that basis to deny it to Ignatius, who (Koester claims) was basically a monist ("Geschichte und Kultus im Johannesevangelium," pp. 59f.).

[1] Théo Preiss, "La mystique de l'imitation du Christ et de l'unité chez Ignace d'Antioche," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses*, XVII (1938), 214f. On p. 216 Preiss makes this statement: "Cette croyance a la similitude et en somme, a l'identité de la condition future du sauveur et du croyant sauvé est donc à la base et de la martyrologie et de la christologie d'Ignace." For an excellent study of the suffering motif in Paul see Erhardt Güttgemanns, *Der leidende Apostel und Sein Herr: Studien zur paulinischen Christologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).

The gospel events are primarily significant for Ignatius because of their cosmic effect in destroying hostile powers and introducing eternal life as a new element in world history. In the controversial passage in Eph. 19:2-3, Ignatius expresses these thoughts in mythical language:

> How then was he revealed to the aeons?
> A star shone in heaven beyond all the stars.
> Its light was inexpressible;
> its newness caused astonishment.
> All the other stars with the sun and the moon
> formed a chorus for this star.
> And it surpassed them all in light.
> There was bewilderment whence this new thing so unlike them came.
>
> As a result, all magic began to be dissolved,
> every bond of wickedness began to vanish away,
> ignorance began to be removed,
> and the destruction of the old kingdom was initiated,
> when God was manifested as man for the newness of eternal life
> That which had been completed by God received its beginning.
> From then on all things were disturbed,
> because the abolition of death was threatening.

The emphasis in the second eight-line strophe is on the potential destruction of hostile powers which had held man in bondage. The gospel opened up for the first time the possibility of man's evasion of these evil forces (cf. Philad. 6:2; Rom. 7:1; Trall. 4:2; Philad. 8:1). The common view that these events (with the exception of the destruction of death) all belong to the past is made problematic by the puzzling sequence of tenses in this passage.[1] In Eph. 19:2-3, we find two aorists (ἐφανερώθη; ἔλαμψεν), predeeded by a sequence of five aorists in Eph. 18:2-19:1, followed by two imperfects (ἦν; παρεῖχεν), one aorist (ἐγένετο), then eight imperfects (ἦν; ἦν; ἐλύετο; ἠφανίζετο; καθῃρεῖτο; διεφθείρετο; ἐλάμβανεν; συνεκινεῖτο). The question immediately arises, why the variety in tense-sequence? One possible answer is that Ignatius could have switched from the aorist to the imperfect in order to make the description of

[1] The puzzle is compounded by the total silence of commentators on Ignatius with regard to this question. In Milton Brown's study of the use of tenses by Ignatius, he concludes that while Ignatius gives prominence to the aorist among secondary tenses, he does maintain a consistent distinction between punctiliar and durative types of action (*The Authentic Writings of Ignatius: A Study of Linguistic Criteria* [Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1963], p. 86).

events more vivid.[1] The mixture of tenses, however, militates against this interpretation.

The second strophe of Eph. 19:2-3 dispenses with the astral imagery used in the first strophe and exhibits an integrity of its own. This is demonstrated by a common subject matter (the destruction of hostile powers) as well as by a common tense-sequence (six imperfect verbs). The translation of these verbs in the quotation above reflects the assumption that these six verbs must be regarded as inceptive imperfects in that they deal with the initiation of a process or emphasize its potentiality.[2] The advent of Jesus not only initiated the destruction of the hostile powers of evil, but also inaugurated a new era of salvation (Eph. 18:2; 20:1). The extraordinary powers proceeding from Christians united in divine worship[3] were a continuation of the original victory over evil begun in a decisive way by Jesus (Eph. 13:1-2; Trall. 4:2; Smyrn. 3:2; Philad. 8:2; Polyc. 7:1).

For Ignatius, then, the gospel consisted in three basic affirmations regarding Jesus Christ, his Incarnation, Passion and Resurrection. These statements were often augmented by others which emphasized the humanity and historicity of Jesus. The gospel was not only significant for its paradigmatic value for contemporary Christian piety, but also because it was God's initiation of a new dispensation which spelled the doom of the forces opposed to God and secured eternal life or immortality for mankind.

Modes of Appropriating the Benefits of Salvation

"Faith" and "love" are the two interlocking characteristics which Ignatius considered the mark of every true Christian. They also spell out the way in which the salvific benefits of the gospel can be appropriated and expressed;[4] Richardson has called them

[1] Cf. A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 883.

[2] The strongest contextual argument for this interpretation is this phrase from Eph. 19:3: ἀρχὴν δὲ ἐλάμβανεν τὸ παρὰ θεῷ ἀπηρτίσμενον.
The divine plan of God (to which the neuter perfect substantival participle logically refers) was "set in motion" (ἀρχὴν ἐλάβανεν) by the appearance of Jesus Christ. Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Pt. II: *S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp*, Vol. II, Sect. 1 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1885), p. 84: "The appearance of the star was the beginning of the end."

[3] Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, p. 279.

[4] Cf. Smyrn. 6:1; Magn. 1:2. Faith and love may be supplemented by "endurance" (Polyc. 6:2), "peace" (Eph. 13:2), or "unity" (Polyc. 1:2).

"conditions of life." [1] Faith and love together constitute the affirmation of the veracity of the historical propositions contained in the gospel. In itself faith certainly includes the intellectual acceptance of the credo as the indispensable presupposition for membership in the local Christian congregation and participation in the sacraments (Trall. 10;1; Magn. 5:2; Smyrn. 2:1; 5:3). Yet because faith involves a total attitude toward the gospel with both intellectual and existential dimensions, the word "intellectual" taken by itself is strangely out of place in characterizing what Ignatius means by faith.

Another significant aspect of Ignatius' conception of faith, and perhaps one of the most discussed, is his conviction that it necessarily involves association with and subjection to the local church as constituted by a bishop and presbyters. Ignatius regarded each local church as *the* Church, as a microcosm of the universal Church,[2] and as an earthly reflection of the unity characteristic of the heavenly Church. In spite of the existence of a large number of local churches, Ignatius could exhort his readers to "hasten to

[1] Cyril C. Richardson, *The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1935), p. 24.

[2] The correctness of this view is underlined by the form in which Ignatius addresses each local church. The destination of each letter consistently takes the same grammatical form: τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ . . . τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν (e.g., Ἐφέσῳ), cf. Eph. inscr.; Magn. inscr.; Trall. inscr.; Philad. inscr.; Smyrn. inscr.; Rom. inscr. (the salutation in the inscription to the Roman letter of Ignatius has been expanded considerably, but still exhibits the same basic grammatical form). This way of modifying a noun with an adjectival participle is called the restrictive attributive, the other alternative being the ascriptive attributive. The restrictive use of the adjectival participle denotes an affirmation that distinguishes the noun qualified as being defined in some special way or marked out in its particular identity. The ascriptive adjectival participle assigns a fact, quality or characteristic directly to the substantive. Cf. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, pp. 1105ff.; H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), pp. 224-25. The ascriptive attributive (e.g., τῇ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ οὔσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ), indicates the entire church, the Ephesian church. The restrictive attributive, on the other hand, indicates *the* Church (i.e., the universal Church) in its Ephesian manifestation. This is supported by K. L. Schmidt's observations on the same grammatical phenomenon in I Cor. 1:2 and II Cor. 1:1: "We have pointed out that the sum of the individual congregations does not produce the total community or the Church. Each community, however small, represents the total community, the Church. This is supported by I C. 1:2 . . . and also by 2 C 1:1. The true rendering here is not 'the Corinthian congregation,' which would stand side by side with the Roman etc., but 'the congregation, church, assembly, as it is in Corinth.'" (*"Ekklēsia,* etc.," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, III, 506).

come all together as to one temple of God, as to one altar, to one Jesus Christ, who came forth from the one Father, and is with one, and departed to one" (Magn. 7:2). When he states that "wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the catholic Church" (Smyrn. 8:2), he is not referring to the universal Church in a spatial sense,[1] but in the sense that each local congregation is a model of the universal or heavenly Church which is united to God through Jesus Christ.

In keeping with his microcosmic view of the local church, Ignatius considers submission to the local bishop as submission to God himself who is bishop of all (Magn. 3:1). The local bishop actually presides in the place of God (Magn. 6:1; Trall. 3:1).[2] True Christians demonstrate the validity of their faith by union with the bishop (Philad. 3:2; Eph. 4:2; 5:3; 6:1; Magn. 4:1). The prerequisite of final union with the Father (the goal of Ignatian as well as of Johannine soteriology), is union with Jesus Christ which can only be implemented by living in harmony and unity with the bishop (Eph. 5:1):

> If in a short time I enjoyed such fellowship with your bishop as was not human but spiritual, how much more do I consider you blessed who are united to him as the Church is with Jesus Christ, and as Jesus Christ is with the Father, that all things may sound together in unison.[3]

---

[1] Preiss, "La mystique de l'imitation du Christ," pp. 232-33.

[2] Henry Chadwick, "The Silence of Bishops in Ignatius," *Harvard Theological Review*, XLIII (1950), 169-72. Chadwick contends that the silence of the bishop referred to by Ignatius (Eph. 6:1), is a type of the silence of God, which Ignatius considers a divine characteristic.

[3] The substantial participle τοὺς ἐγκεκραμένους ("those who are united") in this quotation from Eph. 5:1, referring to the union of the congregation with the bishop, the union of the Church with Jesus Christ and the union of Jesus Christ with the Father is related to Smyrn. 3:2: "And when he [Jesus] came to those with Peter he said to them, 'Take, handle me and see that I am not a bodiless phantom.' And immediately they touched him and believed, with the result that they were united with both his flesh and spirit." Here faith is the result of the disciples' assurance of Jesus' corporeality. The participle κραθέντες ("being united, mingled") indicates action simultaneous with the action of the main verb. Therefore the union of the disciples with the flesh and spirit of Jesus (and with the Father, for Jesus himself was at the same time united in spirit with the Father, cf. Smyrn. 3:3), in the view of Ignatius is paradigmatic for the relationship between Christians and the bishop and presbyters. The entire upper room episode which Ignatius has described in Smyrn. 3:2 has obviously been transformed in the light of a eucharistic theology not unlike that of Ignatius himself.

It is therefore within this context of unity that such expressions as "to participate in God" (μετέχειν θεοῦ, Eph. 4:2), "you are full of God" (γέμετε θεοῦ, Magn. 14:1), and "the congregation in God" (τὸ ἐν θεῷ πλῆθος, Trall. 8:2), must be understood. For Ignatius, salvation is initiated within a united community (Trall. 2:1-2), and cannot exist apart from the community. When Ignatius refers to Jesus Christ as "our inseparable life," it is within the context of subjection to the bishop (Eph. 3:1-2). Presumably, one may separate himself from his "inseparable life" by withdrawing from the community, or leaving the church (Eph. 5:3). For Ignatius, therefore, the concept of unity is basically eschatological, in that the present experience of earthly unity with the local church and its constitutive officers, the locus of the eschatological gift of life, is essentially a reflection of heavenly unity with the Father, the final goal of all Christians.

In addition to defining faith as the means of appropriating the benefits of the gospel through the affirmation of the historicity of the gospel events and through union with and submission to the local church as constituted by its divinely ordained officers, Ignatius also conceived of sacramental participation as a necessary dimension of faith. Baptism was the means of initiation into the local Christian community, while participation in the eucharistic celebration stood at the center of the united worship of the community. Participation in both rites was one of the more significant ways of exhibiting faith in the reality of the gospel events (Eph. 18:2; Smyrn. 7:1).

Ignatius gives no prominence to baptism in his letters, and mentions the word itself only four times (Eph. 18:2; Smyrn. 1:1; 8:2; Polyc. 6:2). Eph. 18:2 and Smyrn. 1:1 both deal with the baptism of Jesus; the former mentions his baptism in a creedal context reminiscent of Matthew 3:15, while the latter reference contains this enigmatical statement: "He was born and baptized in order to purify the water by the Passion." Some hold that this implies the impurity of the waters prior to Jesus' baptism and that in line with Jewish Christian thought, his baptism effected the purification of demon-infested waters.[1] Baptismal waters are thereby given the unique value of eradicating sin, for since they were purified by Jesus, they in turn are able to impart purifica-

[1] Schlier, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, pp. 45ff.; André Benoit, *Le Baptême Chrétien au second Siècle: la théologie des pères* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1953), p. 69.

tion.[1] The difficulty with this interpretation is the absence of positive supportive evidence in the letters of Ignatius. The crucial question is the meaning of this enigmatical statement to Ignatius himself.

Ignatius does seem to be aware of the close connection between baptism and death which is a feature of Matthaean theology.[2] This awareness is reflected in Rom. 7:2:

> My lust has been crucified.
> There is no burning desire for material things in me,
> Only water living and speaking in me,
> Saying to me from within 'Come to the Father.'

If we interpret this reference to water as a figure for the Spirit,[3] we not only have an important connection between baptism and the gift of the Spirit,[4] but also a significant connection between Ignatius' own baptism and his desire to suffer martyrdom. As an imitator of Jesus Christ, Ignatius saw the logic which connected his own baptism with impending death, and was therefore impelled to complete the pattern set by Jesus.

Of the other two references to baptism, Smyrn. 8:2 denies the validity of baptism or eucharistic worship apart from the bishop, perhaps with the implication that heretical groups used separate sacraments.[5] Finally, Polyc. 6:2 contains an exhortation to the bishop of Smyrna:

---

[1] Benoit, *Le Baptême Chrétien*, p. 70; Georg Wustmann, *Die Heilsbedeutung Christi bei den apostolischen Vätern* (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, Heft 2/3; Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1905), p. 188.

[2] Benoit, *Le Baptême Chrétien*, p. 66.

[3] The phrase "living water" in Rom. 7:2 is interpreted as a figure for the Spirit of God by Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 135, n. 7 (Bultmann, of course, denies that "water" in the Fourth Gospel originally signified baptism. John 7:39 was produced by one of the redactors who worked at the end of the assembly line which produced the Fourth Gospel); Hans Lewy, *Sobria Ebrietas: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der antiken Mystik* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, Nr. 9; Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1929), p. 84; Grant, *Ignatius of Antioch*, p. 94 (here Grant notes that living water, like the Spirit, can speak within Ignatius; cf. Philad. 7:1). Other scholars interpret water in Rom. 7:2 as baptism: Bauer, "Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia," p. 252; Schlier, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, pp. 146ff.

[4] Benoit makes a connection between baptism and the gift of the Spirit in Ignatius, but concedes that this conclusion is made "malgré le silence d'Ignace" (*Le Baptême Chrétien*, p. 76).

[5] *Supra*, p. 59, n. 4.

Let your baptism remain as your arms,
Your faith as a helmet,
Your love as a spear,
Your endurance as a panoply.
Let your actions be your deposits
That you might receive the back pay due you.

In spite of the possible connection of this passage with canonical Eph. 6:10-17, the word ὅπλα ("arms") stands here as a summary of the arms and armour enumerated. Allegorically these war implements stand for faith, love and endurance. Baptism comprehends all of these qualities, and constitutes the basis for their implementation in the lives of Christians.

In view of the scholarly effort which has been expended on the subject of the eucharist in Ignatius, the task of reducing the topic to a few summary paragraphs becomes extremely problematical.[1] Our main concern is the meaning of eucharistic worship within the context of Ignatian thought and how it relates to his view of eschatological salvation, and not its *religionsgeschichtliche* derivation. As the central focus of the cult, participation in eucharistic worship was both a confession of faith in the gospel verities (Smyrn. 7:1), and the indispensable means for participating in the Passion of Jesus Christ (Philad. 3:3).[2] When Ignatius speaks of the eucharist as supplying immortality and eternal life (Eph. 20:2), this affirmation must be understood within the total context of his thought. Participation in the eucharist for Ignatius is neither a "magische Verleihung einer Kraft," [3] since the famous phrase φάρμακον ἀθανασίας ("medicine of immortality") in Eph. 20:2 must be interpreted figuratively rather than literally,[4] nor does it result in

[1] For a recent bibliography and chronological discussion of the scholarly views on the subject from Schlier (1929) to 1966, see P. Serra Zanetti, *Bibliografia Eucaristica Ignaziana Recente* (Miscellanea Liturgica, Vol. I; Rome: Desclee & C. Editori Pontifici, 1966).

[2] The phrase συγκατατίθεσθαι τῷ πάθει ("to be in agreement with the passion") in Philad. 3:3 can be interpreted as a reference to the eucharist because of the phrase immediately following in Philad. 4:1: σπουδάσατε οὖν μιᾷ εὐχαριστίᾳ χρῆσθαι.

[3] Bartsch, *Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition*, p. 79. Against this view see Grant, *Ignatius of Antioch*, p. 53; Bultmann, "Ignatius und Paulus," pp. 47f.; *idem*, *Theology of the New Testament*, II, 193.

[4] While the phrase φάρμακον ἀθανασίας was used in the mystery religions (cf. T. R. Glover, *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire* [London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1909], p. 158; Richard Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* [Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1927], pp. 83, 393, 400), there is no strong evidence to suggest that Ignatius interpreted the phrase literally (against Rudolf Bultmann, *"Athanasia," Theological Dic-*

the ontological transformation of the participant. Both baptism and the eucharist form only part of the whole economy or dispensation of salvation; they are, as it were, links in the chain of salvation which binds a man to God.[1] Other links (to continue the metaphor), include belief in the actuality of the gospel events, and union with the local church. We have yet to discuss the importance of following the example of Jesus, which may entail suffering and martyrdom, and obedience to the commands of Jesus and the Apostles. All of these are necessary elements for Ignatius in a Christian's relationship to God. A single broken link results in the destruction of the entire chain.[2]

When Ignatius speaks of being united with Jesus Christ, he does not understand this apart from participation in eucharistic worship, for "unless a man be within the sanctuary he lacks the bread of God" (Eph. 5:2). Participation in the eucharist is an indispensable means for the appropriation of a salvation which will only be fully realized eschatologically. The sacramental unity of all aspects of the new dispensation of God is demonstrated by the way in which Ignatius considers faith equivalent to the flesh of the Lord, and blood to the love of Christ (Trall. 8:1; Rom. 7:3; Philad. 4:1; 5:1). Participation in the sacraments is also the presupposition for the achievement of victory against Satan (Eph. 13:1).

For Ignatius, then, faith is not only an intellectual affirmation of the actuality of the gospel events, but also an implementation of that affirmation through union with the local church and participation in its valid sacraments. Faith, however, is incomplete without love, and perfect faith implies its fulfilment and completion in love.[3] While faith is that response to the gospel which initiates

---

tionary of the New Testament, III, 23f.). As Grant suggests, the phrase is no more literal than the "deadly drug" referred to in Trall. 6:2 (*Ignatius of Antioch*, p. 53),

[1] Nock, *Early Gentile Christianity*, p. 126, n. 1: ". . . in fact the sacramentalism of Ignatius is only part of his general belief in God and in Christ; 'you are full of God' (Magn. 14) expresses a total attitude. To isolate what we have come to think of as the sacraments is to misunderstand the whole early Christian movement," Cf. *supra*, pp. 17f.

[2] This position is an attempt to qualify such inordinately strong statements as that made by Koester, "Geschichte und Kultus im Johannesevangelium," p. 61: "Die Aneigung des Heils ist sakramental möglich und nur so möglich."

[3] The full range of Ignatius' conception of love and its related conceptions is discussed by J. Colson, "Agape chez Saint-Ignace d'Antioche," *Texte und Untersuchungen*, LXXVIII (1961), 341-53.

an individual's relationship to God,[1] it must produce love which is the goal of life (Eph. 14:1). The three aspects of love which we shall consider in the thought of Ignatius include: (1) the life of the Christian understood as an *imitatio Christi*, (2) the necessity of obeying the commands of Christ and the Apostles, and (3) the necessity of persevering "until the end" to assure the full attainment of salvation.

Ignatius conceives of the Christian life in terms of the pattern set by Jesus Christ.[2] The importance of the *imitatio Christi* for the thought of Ignatius is underscored by passages such as Eph. 10:3:

> Let us be imitators of the Lord
> And seek who may suffer the more wrong,
> Be the more destitute,
> The more despised.
> That no plant of the Devil may be found in you,
> But that you remain with all purity and sobriety in Jesus Christ,
> Both in the flesh and in the spirit.

When Ignatius describes the Trallian Christians as being imitators of God, he clearly has Jesus in mind (Trall. 1:2; cf. Eph. 1:1; 10:3).[3] He can make this affirmation because Jesus himself imitated the Father, so that an imitation of Jesus is ultimately an imitation of God himself (Philad. 7:2; cf. Eph. 1:3).

Ignatius' own willingness to suffer and die for Christ is so real and so intimately connected with the actuality of Jesus' own suffering and death that Ignatius can use his own commitment to suffering and eventual martyrdom as an apologetic for underscoring the reality of Jesus' Passion (Trall. 10:1; Smyrn. 4:2). He expresses this thought particularly well in Smyrn. 5:1:

> There are some who ignorantly deny him,
> Or rather were denied by him,
> Because they are advocates of death
> Rather than of the truth.
> Neither the prophecies
> Nor the Law of Moses can persuade them,
> Nor (up to the present) even the gospel,
> Nor our own individual sufferings.

---

[1] Faith can therefore be spoken of as a past event (Magn. 9:1), and as the beginning of life (Eph. 14:1).

[2] *Supra*, pp. 140f.

[3] Bauer, "Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia," p. 196.

Ignatius' definition of discipleship is so bound up with the ideal of complete conformity to the life of Jesus that he is convinced that only by suffering and dying can he become a true disciple (Eph. 1:2; 3:1; Rom. 5:3). When he refers to Jesus as the "perfect man" Smyrn. 4:2), it is in the sense that Jesus has successfully endured and reached the goal of the Incarnation: suffering, death and resurrection.[1] For Ignatius, persecution is the logical outcome of living "according to Jesus Christ" (Magn. 8:2; cf. Smyrn. 4:2).[2] This is primarily due to the enmity which exists between the world and God (Rom. 3:3; 7:1; cf. 2:2).[3] Since suffering is instrumental in achieving perfection, Ignatius can speak of his chains as "spiritual pearls" (Eph. 11:2; cf. 3:1). When he says that "in him I carry about my chains" (Eph. 11:2), he means that his suffering is

[1] The same emphasis on the obedience of Jesus is frequently expressed in the Letter to the Hebrews (2:10f.; 2:18; 5:9; 7:28).

[2] The identical theological orientation reflecting the inevitability of persecution is found in the hymn quoted in II Tim. 2:11-13:

The saying is sure:
If we have died with him, we shall live with him.
If we endure, we shall also reign with him.
If we deny him, he will also deny us.
If we are faithless, he remains, faithful, (for he cannot deny himself).

In this passage, suffering and martyrdom (parallel expressions in the structure of II Tim. 2:11) are viewed as a way of imitating Christ, and therefore constitutes a reinterpretation of the Pauline conception of dying and rising with Christ. Since συναπεθάνομεν is parallel to ὑπομένομεν in this passage, the former verb must refer to the death of martyrdom, not to death in the mystical Pauline sense. The same emphasis is also expressed in II Tim. 3:12, where it is claimed that "all who desire to live a godly life in Christ Jesus will be persecuted." This is one of the significant links which place the Pastorals, Ignatius and Polycarp within the same theological tradition. It is perhaps worth noting that II Tim. 2:11-13 shows no signs of having come from a Semitic original (against Joachim Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus* [Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Teilbd. 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963], p. 48). Rather, the passage contains a number of rhetorical features characteristic of diatribe rhetoric (e.g., anaphora, statements of reciprocity, antithesis, homoioteleuton, etc.). It is perhaps because he has not been consious of the influence of this kind of rhetoric on Ignatius that Alfred Adam can say: "Die Theologie des Ignatius stellt eine selbständige Durchdringung der Verkündigungsgrundlagen dar und lässt in der Struktur ihrer Sprachgestalt ein aramäisches Denken erkennen, so dass eine nichtjüdische Herkunft des Verfassers zu vermuten ist" (*Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Bd. 1: *Die Zeit der alten Kirche* [Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1965], p. 132.

[3] In the theology of Marcion of Sinope (which has its roots in Syria and Asia Minor, the result of man's liberation from the *regnum creatoris* was the hatred and enmity of the world, primarily expressed in persecution of various kinds (cf. *infra*, p. 199).

the means of identification with and the imitation of Christ (Eph. 8:2; Rom. 1:1; Philad. 5:1; 7:2).

While suffering is the chief mode of imitating Christ which concerns Ignatius, he does mention other ways of following Christ's example in passing. For example, Ignatius commends continence "in honor of the flesh of the Lord," providing that the individual ascetic keep himself from boasting or even letting on to anyone except the bishop.[1] Again, meekness is a characteristic of Jesus which the Christian must emulate (Trall. 8:1; Eph. 10:2). The opposite qualities of meekness, pride or haughtiness (a characteristic which Ignatius greatly fears, cf. Trall. 4:1-2), separate a man from both Christ and the church (Trall. 7:1-2; Eph. 5:2-3; Magn. 12:1; Polyc. 5:2).

Another implication of love for Ignatius is obedience to the commands of the Lord and the Apostles. While the necessity of of obeying these commands is frequently mentioned, Smyrn. 6:2 is one of the rare passages in the Ignatian corpus in which the content of these commands is spelled out:

> They [schismatics] have no concern for love,
> None for the widow,
> None for the orphan,
> None for the distressed,
> None for the afflicted,
> None for the prisoner, or the one released from prison,
> None for the hungry or thirsty.

Ignatius was able to characterize those with whom he corresponded as demonstrators of Christian love because they ministered to him along the route of his forced march (Eph. 1:1-2; 2:1; Trall. 1:1-2; 3:2; 12:1; Smyrn. 9:2; 10:2). Ignatius considered exemplary behavior toward outsiders (Eph. 10:1-3; Trall. 8:2), as well as toward Christians to be mandatory (Magn. 6:2; 13:1).

Finally, Ignatius' view of the conditionality of salvation and the attendant need for perseverance can be clearly seen in Eph. 14:2:

> No man who professes faith sins,
> Nor does he who has obtained love hate.
> The tree is known by its fruits;
> So they who profess to be of Christ shall be seen by their deeds.
> For the deed is not in present profession,
> But is shown by the power of faith—
> If a man continues to the end.

[1] Cf. Henry Chadwick, "Enkrateia," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. V, cols. 352-53.

Ignatius frequently expressed the fear that he might not make it successfully to the goal of dying for Christ (Philad. 5:1-2; Rom. 1:1-2; Trall. 12:3; 13:3).

The Nature and Significance of Eschatological Salvation

After briefly discussing Ignatius' conception of the gospel, together with the ways of appropriating and maintaining the benefits of salvation under the rubrics faith and love, it now remains for us to consider those benefits themselves and to delineate the ways in which Ignatius conceptualized eschatological salvation. The content of eschatological salvation for Ignatius primarily revolves about such concepts as "resurrection," "life," "immortality," "attaining God," and to a considerably lesser extent, "salvation" and the "kingdom of God." [1] Our chief concern in considering these various ways of conceptualizing eschatological salvation will be to determine whether in fact Ignatius does maintain a balanced tension between the present realization and future fulfilment of eschatological salvation in a sense approximating Pauline or Johannine thought as Bultmann and others affirm.

Ignatius, like Paul, considers the reality of the resurrection of Jesus to be a guarantee of the future resurrection of believers. This futuristic emphasis is found, for example, in Trall. 9:2: "He was really raised from the dead, for his Father raised him, just as his Father will raise us who believe on him." The reality of the general resurrection of believers as a future eschatological event is clearly an indispensable part of the eschatology of Ignatius (Rom. 4:3; Eph. 11:2; Smyrn. 7:1; Trall. inscr.; Polyc. 7:1).[2] Bultmann

[1] Many of the results of salvation which are stressed in the letters of Paul, but are less eschatological in nature, receive only marginal notice by Ignatius. The doctrine of justification, for example, is reproduced "intellectually" or formally by Ignatius in Rom. 5:1 through an allusion to I Cor. 4:4. Similarly, in Eph. 12:1 Ignatius refers to the Ephesians as "those who have obtained mercy" (perfect tense), and in Magn. 8:1 he implies that Christians "have received grace" (perfect tense). Cf. W. Foerster, "*Sōdzō*, etc.," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, VII, 1000.

[2] The articular use of ἀνάστασις appears to be the way in which Ignatius refers to the future general resurrection as a particular event (Polyc. 7:1; Trall. inscr.). This supposition is partially confirmed by his care in using the definite article when referring to the resurrection of Jesus (Philad. inscr.; 8:2; 9:2; Magn. 11:1; Smyrn. 3:1; 3:3; 1:2; 7:2). Two apparent exceptions, Eph. 20:1 and Smyrn. 12:2, are very similar in structure, and it is apparent that the definite article has been omitted for sylistic reasons.

contends that the future resurrection in the theology of Ignatius is primarily a formal element without great material significance.[1] As a result of his conviction that Ignatius did comprehend the paradoxical nature of Christian existence, an existence between "already" and "not yet," [2] Bultmann contends that the resurrection was not only a future event for Ignatius, but also an event which

---

If Smyrn. 5:3 ("the passion, which is our resurrection") refers, as I will shortly maintain, to the future resurrection of believers, the absence of the article is due to the presence of the possessive pronoun ὑμῶν, which sufficiently particularizes the noun it modifies.

An impressive confirmation of Ignatius' belief in a final general resurrection is found in Polyc. 6:1, where the compound verb συνεγείρεσθε is used: "Labor with one another, struggle together, run together, suffer together, rest together, rise up together as God's stewards and assessors and servants." Some commentators find in this passage a reference to the future general resurrection (e.g., Grant, *Ignatius of Antioch*, p. 135), while others do not (e.g., Lightfoot, *S. Ignatius*, p. 351). The following arguments support the interpretation of this passage as a reference to the future general resurrection: (1) The word ἐγείρειν in Ignatius always refers to the resurrection from the dead (Magn. 9:2; Trall. 9:2 [twice]; Smyrn. 7:1), (2) The only other occurence of the word κοιμᾶσθαι (without the prefix) in Rom. 4:2 refers also to death, (3) The only other reference to συμπάσχειν in Smyrn. 4:2 also refers to the suffering which precedes martyrdom, and (4) In Polycarp's letter to the Philippians 9:2 (significant because Polycarp was the original recipient of the letter in which the passage under discussion is found), he uses the words τρέχειν and συμπάσχειν as athletic imagery, and yet both words in this passage are applied to the martyrs Zosimus and Rufus. In Polyc. 6:1, Lightfoot's chief objection to interpreting the terms συγκοιμᾶσθε and συνεγείρεσθε as references to death and resurrection is because he feels that the imagery begun under the analogy of athletic training (συγκοπιᾶτε, συναθλεῖτε, συντρέχετε) must be continued: "Thus συγκοιμᾶσθε, συνεγείρεσθε will refer to the uniform hours of going to bed and getting up prescribed by the trainer to the athletes under his charge" (Lightfoot, *S. Ignatius*, p. 351). While Lightfoot's contention is certainly correct, the meaning of the imagery in this passage of Ignatius is certainly death and resurrection.

[1] Bultmann implies rather than explicitly states this judgment when he refers to the statement of Ignatius in Magn. 9:2 to the effect that the prophets have been raised (aorist tense) from the dead, and observes: "Aber versteht er, Ignatius, die Auferstehung von den Toten als einen Akt des künftigen eschatologischen Dramas, wenn er sagen kann, dass Christus durch seine Ankunft die Propheten von den Toten erweckt hat (Mg 9, 2)?" ("Ignatius und Paulus," p. 43). The easiest thing to do with this enigmatical statement of Ignatius is to relate it to the tradition contained in Matt. 27:52-53 and/or Christ's descent into Sheol; cf. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, pp. 26-33; Virginia Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), pp. 179-80. A mass of parallels are cited in Werner, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, p. 264, n. 98.

[2] Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, II, 198.

was at the same time paradoxically present.[1] We shall individually consider the passages from Ignatius which Bultmann offers in support for his position.

1. Bultmann cites Smyrn. 7:2 as evidence for the fact that Ignatius regards the resurrection as a paradoxically realized phenomenon: "in which the passion has been revealed to us and the resurrection has been accomplished" (ἐν ᾧ τὸ πάθος ἡμῖν δεδήλωται καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τετελείωται).[2] Here the accomplishment of the resurrection is expressed with a verb in the perfect, and this is undoubtedly the force of Bultmann's argument. The relative pronoun ᾧ modifies the immediately preceding noun "the gospel," and it is apparent that the resurrection of which Ignatius is speaking is the resurrection of Jesus, not that of Christians.[3] However, since the future general resurrection of believers is based on the actuality of the resurrection of Jesus, Ignatius can claim that the resurrection "has been accomplished" in the gospel. The articular use of ἀνάστασις in this passage indicates that Ignatius is either referring to the resurrection of Jesus or the future general resurrection; the context makes it necessary to opt for the first alternative.

2. Bultmann interprets Philad. 9:2 in the light of Smyrn. 7:2, making the latter a confirmation of his interpretation of the former.[4] Philad. 9:2 reads: "the gospel is the perfection of incorruption" (τὸ δὲ εὐαγγέλιον ἀπάρτισμά ἐστιν ἀφθαρσίας). In Philad. 8-9, the context of the passage under discussion, Ignatius refers to the prophets who pointed to Christ predictively, and (contrary to his opponents), considers the gospel as the fulfilment of prophetic expectation. Immortality or salvation, in the view of Ignatius, was achieved by Jesus in the new dispensation of God, not during the Old Testament era (cf. Eph. 20:2-3). This passage, therefore, has nothing to say about the possibility of present salvation for the individual Christian, but simply indicates that immortality as a gift of God has been provided through Jesus Christ.

[1] Bultmann, "Ignatius und Paulus," pp. 44-45. The arguments for the paradoxical present realization of resurrection existence in Ignatius which Bultmann advances in this article are not found in his *Theology of the New Testament*.

[2] Bultmann, "Ignatius und Paulus," p. 44.

[3] Cf. *supra*, p. 139f., where we observed that for Ignatius the gospel *is* Jesus Christ, and includes the basic elements of the Incarnation, the Passion and the Resurrection.

[4] Bultmann, "Ignatius und Paulus," p. 44.

3. Bultmann also attempts to demonstrate the realized aspect of resurrection existence in Ignatius by calling attention to the latter's characterization of the existence of heretics as only a semblance (Trall. 10; Smyrn. 2), in contrast with the real existence experienced and enjoyed by Christians (Magn. 10:1).[1] Thus in Smyrn. 2:1, we have this statement:

> He suffered all these things for us that we might gain salvation,
> And he suffered truly, just as he truly raised himself.
> Not as some unbelievers say, 'His Passion was a mere semblance.'
> But it is they who are 'a mere semblance.'
> Even according to their opinions shall it happen to them;
> They shall be bodiless and phantasmal.

This statement—almost verbally identical with Trall. 10:1—should not be interpreted as a pronouncement by Ignatius on the ontological nature of heretics, but rather should be viewed within the context of Ignatian rhetoric as a figurative application of future existence to the present.[2]

The statement in the central couplet quoted above ("Not as some unbelievers say, 'His Passion was a mere semblance.' / But it is they who are 'a mere semblance.' "), resembles the eschatological *ius talionis* analyzed by Käsemann,[3] as well as the "statements of reciprocity" discussed by Grant.[4] This type of hyperbole characteristic of diatribe rhetoric is found elsewhere in the letters of Ignatius. In Smyrn. 5:2, for example, we find this statement:

> How can anyone benefit me if he praise me but slanders my Lord,
> Not confessing that he is clothed with flesh [σαρκοφόρον]?
> The one who says this has denied him absolutely;
> He is clothed with a corpse [νεκροφόρος].

Yet another of these hyperbolic antithetical statements is found in Smyrn. 4:2: "If it is merely in semblance that these things were done by our Lord, / Then I also am a prisoner in semblance."

We can only conclude that on the basis of the way in which Ignatius uses language, both Trall. 10 and Smyrn. 2 must be viewed a figurative descriptions of his heretical opponents based on what he knows will be their future destiny.

[1] *Ibid.*

[2] Another example of this kind of rhetoric is found in Philad. 6:1, where Ignatius describes his Judaizing opponents as "tombstones and sepulchres of the dead, on whom only the names of men are written."

[3] *Supra*, pp. 123f.

[4] *Supra*, p. 123, n. 2. However Grant's characterization of Ignatius' rhetoric as "Asianic" is probably incorrect. There are nevertheless close resemblances between Asianism and the Cynic-Stoic diatribe form (see Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, I, 130f.).

4. The final, and most difficult, passage which Bultmann adduces in support of his position is Smyrn. 5:3: "the Passion, which is our resurrection" (τὸ πάθος ὅ εστιν ἡμῶν ἀνάστασις).[1] Bultmann interprets this passage as an affirmation of the present realization of resurrection existence in the theology of Ignatius. For Ignatius, unbelievers could have no part in the resurrection (Smyrn. 7:1; 2:1; 4:1), and the resurrection of believers is only possible because of the actuality of the Passion of Jesus. Smyrn. 5:3 has a very close parallel in Trall. inscr.: "Ignatius to the church as it is at Tralles . . . having peace in the flesh and in the spirit through the Passion of Jesus Christ who is our hope through our resurrection unto him." Here the word "hope" indicates that the resurrection referred to is that which will occur on the Day of Judgment.[2] For Ignatius, therefore, participation in the Passion of Jesus is the condition for future participation in the general resurrection. To put it in a slightly different way, future resurrection is entirely dependent on whether or not the individual believer appropriates the salvific benefits which Jesus provided through his death. Participation in eucharistic worship, for Ignatius the cultic affirmation of the reality of Christ's death, becomes therefore the indispensable means for eventually sharing in Christ's resurrection from the dead.[3] However, the futurity of the resurrection militates against reading into this passage a sacramental dying and rising with Christ.[4] We must conclude, therefore, that the resurrection referred to in Smyrn. 5:3 is a future event guaranteed to those who presently appropriate the salvific benefits of the gospel.[5]

The discussion to this point has revealed that Bultmann has produced no significant evidence in support of his contention that Ignatius viewed the resurrection as a future reality paradoxically realized in the present experience of believers. When Ignatius makes use of the noun and verbs for "resurrection," the reference is invariably future.[6]

---

[1] Bultmann, "Ignatius und Paulus," p. 44.

[2] Bultmann himself considers the passage quoted above from Trall. inscr. to refer to the resurrection as a future hope of salvation ("Ignatius und Paulus," p. 43, n. 2).

[3] Bartsch, *Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition*, p. 122.

[4] Schweitzer, *Mysticism of Paul*, p. 341, observes that neither Polycarp nor Ignatius ever argues from the conception that believers have already died and risen again with Christ.

[5] Grant, *Ignatius of Antioch*, p. 118.

[6] Richardson, *The Christianity of Ignatius*, p. 28.

Since resurrection is only one way of conceptualizing future eschatological salvation as a present reality, we have not yet produced a decisive argument against Bultmann's contention that Ignatius held the paradoxical nature of Christian existence as an existence "already" realized, but still "not yet" fully achieved. We must now consider whether Ignatius conceptualizes the present realization of eschatological salvation in any other way, perhaps through the motif of dying and rising with Christ to new life. This involves the consideration of the way in which Ignatius conceptualized eschatological salvation through the terms "life" and "death".

One of the more significant passages which is thought by many to show some of the influence of Pauline mysticism upon Ignatius is Magn. 5:2: "Unless we willingly choose to die through him in his Passion, his life is not in us" (δι' οὗ ἐὰν μὴ αὐθαιρέτως ἔχομεν τὸ ἀποθανεῖν εἰς τὸ αὐτοῦ πάθος, τὸ ζῆν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν). The important question which we must ask is this: does τὸ ἀποθνήσκειν require a figurative interpretation in the Pauline sense of dying to sin (cf. canonical Rom. 6:4), or does the word mean death in the literal sense? Throughout the entire Ignatian corpus there is no quotation or allusion to the motif of dying and rising with Christ which is demonstrably derived from the Pauline letters.[1]

In considering Ignatius' use of the word ἀποθνήσκειν, we find that out of thirteen occurrences of the term, only once is it used in a figurative sense (Rom. 6:2). There Ignatius tells the Roman church that if they obstruct his impending marytrdom, life will really be death so far as he is concerned—a typical example of Ignatius' lavish use of antithesis in his rhetoric. Prejudice against interpreting τὸ ἀποθνήσκειν in a figurative Pauline sense grows still stronger when we consider Rom. 4:1: "I am dying for willingly the sake of God" (ἐγὼ ἑκὼν ὑπὲρ θεοῦ ἀποθνήσκω). Here the context demands that ἀποθνήσκειν be interpreted literally. As far as Ignatius is concerned, discipleship unavoidably involves the possibility of martyrdom, a possibility that must not be approached with fear and trepidation, but rather with willingness and joy.[2] We can only conclude that in Magn. 5:2, the death spoken of must be a literal death that Ignatius expected to experience "willingly" because of his commitment to the reality and efficacy of the Passion of Christ.

[1] *Supra*, p. 156, n. 4.
[2] *Supra*, pp. 149ff.

Magn. 5:2 cannot have in view a sacramental dying with Christ through participation in the eucharist,[1] for then the adverb αὐθαιρέτως ("willingly") would be meaningless. How could one participate in eucharistic worship any other way than "willingly"?

That a mystical dying with Christ through participation in eucharistic worship cannot be in view in Magn. 5:2 is at least partially supported by the conclusions of Théo Preiss in his comparative study of Pauline and Ignatian mysticism. He calls Ignatian mysticism a "mystique d'imitation" in contrast to Paul's "mystique de participation."[2] While in Pauline mysticism death is closely connected to baptism, and is therefore a realized phenomenon lying in the past, the mysticism of Ignatius is closely related to the eucharist, and is therefore a mystical identification with Christ which lies in the present or future. Because identification with the death of Christ through baptism lies in the past for Paul, there is no tendency to imitate the passion of Jesus and any special value of martyrdom is *a priori* excluded.[3] Ignatius, on the other hand, was convinced that resurrection with Jesus would be the result of suffering and dying as a martyr.[4] Preiss goes further, however, and opens up the possibility of sacramentally dying and rising with Christ through participation in the eucharist.[5]

[1] Wustmann, *Die Heilsbedeutung Christi*, p. 101, finds the influence of Pauline mysticism in Smyrn. 1:1, where Ignatius states that the Smyrnaeans are firm in their faith "as if nailed to the cross." However, this simile, unlike Pauline metaphors (cf. Gal. 2:20), has nothing to do with identification with Christ, but concerns the immoveability of the faith of the Smyrnaeans. Wustmann concludes, "und dass Ign. 'lies [Einheit mit Christus] nicht nur als ein leibliches Nacherleben seines Sterbens und Auferstehens versteht, sondern auch als ein innerliches Sterben und Neugeborenwerden, zeigt eben eine Stelle wie Magn. 5, 2. vgl. Trall. 8, 1." It is clear that Wustmann's entire case is built upon a mystical interpretation of Magn. 5:2. "Eine Stelle wie Magn. 5, 2" is scholarly jargon which really means that this is the only passage he could find to support "ein innerliches Sterben und Neugeborenwerden."

[2] Preiss, "La mystique de l'imitation du Christ," p. 207. In my opinion, the use of the term "mysticism" with respect to Ignatius as in the case of the Fourth Gospel, is subject to grave reservations (cf. *supra*, pp. 60f).

[3] Preiss, "La mystique de l'imitation du Christ," pp. 204f.

[4] Benoit, *Le Baptême Chrétien*, p. 81: "Pour Paul le fait de mourir et de ressusciter avec le Christ est acquis par le baptême, la vie ultérieure du chrétien n'étant plus que le développement de ce fait premier. Pour Ignace la situation est iversée: la mort et la résurrection avec le Christ seront l'aboutissement des souffrances et de la passion du martyr."

[5] Preiss, "La mystique de l'imitation du Christ," p. 235; Bartsch, *Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition*, p. 122. I would agree with Bartsch only to the extent of seeing in Ignatius the sacramental aspect of the "durch

There is, in my opinion, no trace in Ignatius of a sacramental identification with the death of Jesus in such a way that this death becomes a figurative mystical experience in either the past or present. All such mystical interpretations of Ignatius' eucharistic theology are ultimately based on a mystical interpretation of Magn. 5:2. This passage cannot bear that interpretation.

Since "life" was Ignatius' favorite term for conceptualizing eschatological salvation, the task which now lies before us is to determine whether it is entirely a future reality, or whether it has a significant dimension in present experience as well.

In Magn. 5:1-2, life as a present and future possession are apparently juxtaposed:

> There is, then an end to all matters,
> And these two things lie before us at the same time: death and life.
> Each individual will go to his own place.
> Just as there are two kinds of coins minted,
> The one by God,
> The other by the world.
> Each of them has its own distinctive impression;
> Those without faith bear the impression of the world,
> Believers have the impression of God the Father in love through Jesus Christ.
> Unless we are prepared to die willingly to share his Passion,
> His life is not us in.

In the first reference to life in this passage, it is treated as a future reality which must be chosen in the present. Ignatius frequently speaks of life as a goal or destination which has not yet been attained.[1] Yet in the second part of the passage cited Ignatius speaks

das Martyrium verliehene Leben" (*ibid.*, p. 116): "Hatte Paulus mit dem Sein in Christus, dem Auferstehungsleben das ganze Leben gemeint, so versteht Ignatius darunter einerseits das durch das Martyrium verliehene Leben, andererseits das im Sakrament durch den mystischen Tod bewirkte neue Leben in Christus, die mystische Gleichförmigkeit mit seiner Auferstehung."

[1] Eph. 17:1: "the life which is set before you" (cf. Heb. 12:1; I Clem. 63:1); Polyc. 2:3: "the prize is immortality and eternal life." In keeping with Ignatius' imitation of Jesus by negating worldly values, he can speak of earthly life as death (Rom. 6:2), and can compare the sufferings of martyrdom to birth pangs (Rom. 6:1). Eph. 11:1 can also be interpreted as having a future reference: μόνον ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησου εὑρεθῆναι εἰς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν. Εις can express the goal or end of an action (Bauer, *Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 228, has many examples). In Milton Brown's analysis of Ignatius' use of prepositions he concluded that εἰς often points to its object as the expected or realized result (Brown, *The Authentic Writings of Ignatius*, p. 70). Eph. 11:1 could thefefore be paraphrased, "only be found in Jesus Christ, the goal of which is eternal life."

of life as a present possession.[1] This life, however, is primarily the life of Jesus, which a believer possesses derivatively.[2] It is in this sense that Ignatius refers to Jesus as "our inseparable life" (Eph. 3:2; cf. Magn. 9:2; 15:2),[3] or "our true life" (Smyrn. 4:1; Trall. 9:2), or again "our everlasting life" (Magn. 1:2). Since Jesus himself, through his Passion, has become true life (Eph. 7:2; cf. John 11:25; 14:6), it is only through a faith relationship with Jesus that an individual may be said to possess life.

Because of the fact that the present possession of life is so dependent on Jesus Christ, we must ask what Ignatius means when he uses such expressions as "in Jesus Christ" (Eph. 20:2; cf. Magn. 9:2; Trall. 9:2). For one thing, eternal life is inextricably connected with the Passion of Jesus (Eph. 7:2; 18:1; Magn. 5:2; 9:1; Trall. 2:1). Smyrn. 1:2 infers that Christians are the fruit of Jesus' Passion, while Trall. 11:2 designates true Christians as "branches of the cross." The salvific benefits of the death of Jesus are (as we have seen)[4] appropriated (1) by faith (Trall. 2:1), (2) by participation in the eucharist (Eph. 20:2), (3) by pursuing a conduct of life "according to Jesus Christ" by obeying the commands of Christ and the Apostles (Magn. 9:1), (4) by submission to the bishop and presbyters of the local community (Trall. 2:1; Magn. 8:1), and (5) by a commitment to "willingly" imitate Jesus Passion in martyrdom, should such be necessary (Magn. 5:2; Rom. 4:1). These are the implications of the expression "in Christ" for Ignatius; each element is an important link in the chain which binds a man to God, and each link must remain unbroken. As a conceptualization of eschatological salvation, therefore, life does not become a factor in present experience through participation in eucharistic worship alone,[5] for to be "in Christ" is a far more

---

[1] According to von der Goltz, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, p. 40, it is only in an ethical sense that life in Ignatius may be considered a "jetziges Eigentum." On p. 41 he makes this sentiment more explicit: "Das Heilsgut als neues Leben ist wesentlich eschatologisch: verbürgte Lebenshoffnung; dagegen die Gottesgemeinschaft und Gotteseinigung ist schon hier im Vollzuge und wartet nur der Vollendung."

[2] This is also the view of the Fourth Evangelist (*supra*, pp. 106ff.).

[3] Cf. *Supra*, p. 145.

[4] *Supra*, pp. 142-52.

[5] Bartsch, *Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition*, p. 111. Bartsch understands the passages which speak of life as a soteriological conception on the basis of Eph. 20:2, in which he regards the expression "medicine of immortality" as a literal rather than figurative expression.

comprehensive term than that. For Ignatius, eschatological life can be initially experienced in this life, but within the framework and context of the local church alone.[1] Since participation in the life of Jesus is subject to all of the characteristics enumerated above, we are left with a strong impression of conditionality with respect to the present possession of eschatological life in Ignatius.

"Immortality" (ἀφθαρσία), which Ignatius equates with the attainment of God and eternal life, is also viewed as a goal set before Christians (Polyc. 2:3). The relation of this mode of eschatological salvation to the present experience of Christians is expressed in Magn. 6:2:

> Be then all in conformity with God
> And respect one another.
> Let no man regard his neighbour according to the flesh,
> But in everything love one another in Jesus Christ.
> Let there be nothing in you which can divide you,
> But be united with the bishop and those who preside over you
> As an example and lesson of immortality.

By referring to union with the bishop and presbyters as a τύπος and διδαχή of immortality, immortality itself must be viewed as the antitype and object of instruction; therefore a reality which will only be experienced in the future. Union with the bishop and presbyters of the local church is "an example and lesson of immortality" because it is a reflection of the heavenly unity in the context of which full possession of eschatological life or immortality is possible.[2] Because immortality is synonymous with life, it too is mediated through participation in the eucharist (Eph. 20:2), because it was achieved by Jesus Christ as announced in the gospel (Philad. 9:2). Immortality, like life, may be considered as a conditional present possession, since it was "breathed on the Church"

[1] Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, II, 193: "But with this individualistic piety there is combined an ecclesiastical piety: salvation is available to the individual in the Church." Bultmann should have said that salvation is available to the individual *only* in the Church. Bultmann's conception of the transformation of the church from a fellowship of salvation to an institution of salvation (*ibid.*, II, 114), seems to me to be a completely false analysis of the evolution of early Christianity. The Church (and even the Qumran community before it) is the sphere in which the present realization of eschatological salvation is experienced. Properly understood, the words of Cyprian can be written over the entire development of early Christianity: "extra ecclesiam nulla salus" (cf. *supra*, p. 11).

[2] *Supra*, pp. 143ff.

(Eph. 17:1),[1] and an individual partakes of this gift through a relationship with Christ which takes place and is implemented within the setting of the local church.

The most personal expression which Ignatius uses to express his own longing for salvation is "to attain God" (ἐπιτυχεῖν Θεοῦ). He frequently expresses the desire that he will "attain God" by remaining faithful in his present situation of suffering, soon to culminate in martyrdom (Rom. 1:2; 2:1; 4:1; 8:3; 9:2; Eph. 12:2; Magn. 14:1; Trall. 13:3; Smyrn. 11:1; Polyc. 7:1). In Polyc. 2:3 he exhorts the bishop of Smyrna to be prepared to attain to God since the time calls him. It is clear that this expression always has a future reference in Ignatius,[2] and seems to presuppose that martyrdom is a direct way to God.[3] Ignatius frequently expresses the apprehension that he will not prove worthy "unto the end," and it is because of this fear that he requests prayer from the various churches (Rom. 1:1-2; Eph. 14:2; Polyc. 7:1). The futurity of eschatological salvation, which for Ignatius is attainment of God, underlines the fact that for Ignatius, life and immortality are not so much present possessions as the object of future hope. Eschato-

[1] The possible connection between Eph. 17:1 and John 20:22 may indicate a close connection (otherwise not mentioned in Ignatius) between the Spirit and immortality; cf. Grant, *Ignatius of Antioch*, p. 47; Bauer, "Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia," pp. 214ff. gives many parallels to Eph. 17:1. The cultic celebration of the breathing of immortality and the Spirit upon the Church can be seen in the act of the bishop or his representative breathing into the face of the catechumen (cf. Hippolytus *Apostolic Tradition* 20. 8).

[2] Richardson, *The Christianity of Ignatius*, p. 24. Ignatius' desire to attain God should be alternately expressed with the phrases "to attain Christ" (Rom. 5:3), "to attain to being a disciple" (Eph. 1:2), or "to attain the lot" (Philad. 5:1; Trall. 12:3; Rom. 1:2). Foerster understands κλῆρος in these latter three passages in the sense of the impending death of martyrdom (W. Foerster, "*Klēros*, etc.," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, III, 764).

[3] The idea that only martyrs could be immediately admitted into the presence of God is at least as early as the Apocalypse of John (6:9-11; 20:4). IV Maccabees, which Othmar Perler has shown to be an influence on the vocabulary and rhetoric of Ignatius, contains a similar idea that martyrs are at one admitted into the presence of God (IV Macc. 16:25; cf. 7:19; 10:15; 13:17; 17:4, 18; 18:23). Charles (*Eschatology*, p. 300), claims that this view is held only by Alexandrian writers. The same idea is found in a much more developed form in Tertullian (*De res.* 43. 4: "nemo enim peregrinatus a corpore statim inmoratur penes dominum, nisi ex martyrii praerogatiua, paradiso scilicet, non infernis deuersurus."; cf. *De anima* 55. 4; 55. 5; *Ad martyr.* 1. 3; 2. 9). However, there is no evidence in the letters of Ignatius to suggest that martyrs alone could "attain God."

logical salvation is present within the Christian community, but an individual only participates in that salvation conditionally. The full and irreversible possession of the benefits of eschatological salvation are dependent upon final eschatological unity with God in eternity through Jesus Christ and in the company of the Apostles.

The two references which Ignatius makes to the kingdom of God reveal the slight influence which that concept had upon him. The inheritance of the kingdom is clearly a future event in Eph. 16:1: "Adulterers shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Punishment by death and torment in fire will be the lot of those who do not inherit the kingdom of God (Eph. 16:2).

The other reference to the kingdom of God (Philad. 3:3), poses a more difficult interpretive problem: "Be not deceived, brothers. If anyone follows a maker of schism, he does not inherit the kingdom of God. If any man walks in strange doctrine, he has no part in the Passion." All four of the verbs are in the present tense. The reference to the Passion in the second part of the passage concerns participation in eucharistic worship. A heretic, therefore, who stands outside the church, cannot participate in the eucharistic and consequently has no part in the Passion. If this conditional clause refers to the present, does it then follow that in the first conditional clause the kingdom of God is also inherited in the present? Since both conditions are assumed as real, Philad. 3:3 could be paraphrased in the following way without doing violence to the meaning: "Followers of schismatics do not inherit the kingdom of God; those who walk in strange doctrine have no part in the Passion." Once Philad. 3:3 is understood in this way, a Pauline statement in I Cor. 15:50 provides a striking parallel: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit [δύναται κληρονομῆσαι] the kingdom of God, nor does corruption inherit [κληρονομεῖ] incorruption." Here, as in Philad. 3:3, we have examples of the gnomic use of the present tense (cf. I Cor. 15:42-44 for further examples); that is, we have an aoristic present which is "timeless in reality." The subject and object of the verbs are mutually exclusive. Corruption *never* inherits incorruption; schismatics *never* inherit the kingdom of God. The temporal use of the present recedes behind the relatively uncommon use of the present in a punctiliar sense.[1] The reference to inheriting the kingdom of God in Philad. 3:3, therefore must

[1] Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, p. 866.

be understood as a reference to the future inheritance of the kingdom.[1]

Finally, Ignatius refers infrequently to Jesus as "savior" (Eph. 1:1; Magn. inscr.; Philad. 9:2; Smyrn. 7:1).[2] The noun σωτηρία ("salvation") is found only in Eph. 18:1, where it is a synonym for everlasting life: "the cross . . . is salvation and eternal life for us." The verb σῴζειν ("to save") is used only three times by Ignatius. In Smyrn. 2:1 and Polyc. 1:2 it is used of the event of salvation as a future occurrence. In Philad. 5:1-2, where the verb is found in the aorist, it refers to the salvation of the Old Testament prophets, and so contributes nothing to our understanding of whether or not Ignatius saw salvation as a present experience.[3]

Conclusions

After considering the various ways in which Ignatius conceptualized eschatological salvation, four conclusions must be drawn.

1. There is no evidence in the letters of Ignatius that eschatological salvation is regarded as a future reality which is none the less paradoxically present in Christian experience. This is certainly true of Ignatius' conception of the resurrection, which is totally future in orientation. In this respect, the views of Ignatius are remarkably similar to those of the Fourth Evangelist, for he too knows no present realization of resurrection existence.[3] The use which Ignatius makes of Pauline terminology is deceptive in that the meaning of the borrowed terms has been radically altered.

2. Similarly, there is no evidence that Ignatius held to the conception of the present experience of a mystical death with Christ through participation in the eucharist. All such interpretations of the eucharistic theology of Ignatius (and there have been many), are ultimately based on Magn. 5:2. We have attempted to demonstrate that this passage cannot bear that interpretation.[4] Ignatius does believe that participation in the eucharist, and so in the Passion of Christ, will probably involve suffering and eventual martyrdom.

[1] This interpretation of the passage is supported by the additional fact that the phrase in Philad. 3:3 appears to be an allusion to I Cor. 6:10, where the verb is found in the future tense.

[2] Foerster, "*Sōdzō*, etc.," p. 1000. There is, of course, no doubt that the possession of eschatological salvation is regarded by Ignatius as a reality which will only be experienced in the future.

[3] *Supra*, pp. 152-56.

[4] *Supra*, pp. 157ff.

3. "Life" was the primary way in which Ignatius conceptualized eschatological salvation. Eternal life in its realized dimension was neither an exclusively sacramental concept (Bartsch), nor an exclusively ethical concept (von der Goltz). Rather, both of these elements were necessary constituents of Ignatius' conception of being "in Christ." Other necessary constituents of that concept include the intellectual affirmation of the reality of the gospel events, subjection to and union with the local church as constituted by the bishop and presbyters, obedience to the commands of Christ and the Apostles, and a willingness to follow Christ's example even to the point of martyrdom. Participation in true life, eternal life, was realized *conditionally*. This condition was (in sum) whether or not an individual remained "in Christ Jesus" until the end of life. As an eschatological reality, life was mediated to present experience in a communal setting through Jesus Christ. An individual's relationship to Christ was the guarantee of the final realization of life in eschatological unity with God through Christ. Because of its conditional nature, we must conclude that "life," as a soteriological concept is always future-oriented in the thought of Ignatius.

4. Finally, one of the initially unforeseeen results of this study has been the recognition that realized eschatology plays but a marginal role in Ignatius' religious thought expressed in his extant letters. This fact is primarily to be accounted for by the genre of his extant writings; they are all occasional letters in which Ignatius is overwhelmingly preoccupied with his own impending martyrdom and harbors the fear that he might somehow disqualify himself from his ultimate goal of "attaining God." For Ignatius, as for the Fourth Evangelist, eschatological salvation was exclusively mediated through the cultic community. From the standpoint of the *individual* Christian (this is the perspective primarily expressed in the Ignatian corpus), the present possession of the benefits of eschatological salvation is dependent upon one's continued organic relationship to the cultic community.[1] From the standpoint of the *cultic community* itself (this is the perspective which dominates the Fourth Gospel), eschatological salvation is actualized within its midst in an unconditional and irrevocable way.[2]

[1] For this emphasis in the Fourth Gospel, cf. *supra*, pp. 107f.

[2] I find myself in complete disagreement with the contrary thesis expounded by Moule, "The Individualism of the Fourth Gospel," cf. *supra*, pp. 13, 61f.

CHAPTER V

THE PRESENT REALIZATION OF ESCHATOLOGICAL SALVATION IN THE ODES OF SOLOMON

INTRODUCTION

The Odes of Solomon, discovered in a nearly complete Syriac manuscript by Rendel Harris in 1905 and subsequently published by him in 1909, have continued to elude scholarly attempts to unravel the tangle of literary and historical problems which they pose.[1] In particular, the difficulty of determining the historical setting of the Odes makes the interpretation of the ways in which eschatological salvation is conceptualized in them extremely precarious. For that reason, our discussion of eschatological salvation in the Odes will be prefaced by a short but necessary treatment of the linguistic and historical questions which they present. The Odes of Solomon are of crucial importance for the history of early Christian theology because of the strong emphasis which they place on realized eschatology. The precise meaning and significance of this phenomenon, however, is dependent on whether or not the original setting of the Odes can be determined. The second section of the present chapter will therefore constitute an attempt to reconstruct the original cultic setting of the Odes.

In the final section of the present chapter we will consider the conception of eschatological salvation found in the Odes. The Odes appear to be prophetic or charismatic hymns of praise and thanksgiving which were of central importance in the worship services of Christian communities in Syria. Participation in the present

[1] A bibliography of 165 items arranged under subject headings has been collected by Gerhard Kittel, *Die Oden Salomos: überarbeitet oder einheitlich?* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1914), pp. 142-53. Another large and much more recent bibliography together with an excellent discussion on the progress of research on the Odes may be found in H. Leclerq, "Odes de Salomon," *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie*, XII, 903-21. See also W. Bauer, "The Odes of Solomon," *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. W. Schneemelcher, trans. R. McL. Wilson, *et al.*, II (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965), 808-10; Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, trans. P. R. Ackroyd (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965), p. 611, n. 2; Johannes Quasten, *Patrology* (Utrecht-Antwerp: Spectrum Publishers, 1950), I, 160-68.

blessings of eschatological salvation through the proleptic experience of partaking in the heavenly worship of God within the framework of an earthly cultic assembly was an experience mediated to the cult leader and his congregation by the Spirit of God. But this is to anticipate the results of our investigation.

The Linguistic Question

Although the problem of the original language of the Odes has been one of the more debated isssues in scholarly research, a majority of the scholars concerned agree that Greek was the original language in which the Odes were composed.[1] Some have continued to defend Syriac as the original language,[2] while still others have favored Hebrew or Aramaic.[3]

[1] Included among the supporters of the Greek origin of the Odes are an impressive number of Semitic scholars: J. Rendel Harris (in his 1909 edition of the Odes), R. H. Connolly, F. C. Burkitt, H. Gunkel, J. Wellhausen, H. Gressmann, T. Schulthess and G. Kittel. Other supporters of a Greek original include P. Batiffol, W. Frankenberg, L. Tondelli, M. Dibelius, W. Bauer, M. Testuz, A. F. J. Klijn and M. Philonenko.

[2] Supporters of the Syriac origin of the Odes include J. H. Bernard, C. Bruston, E. A. Abbott, C. F. Burney, J. R. Harris—A. Mingana, H. Lewy, R. Abramowski, J. de Zwaan and A. Vööbus.

[3] The earliest champion of a Hebrew original for the Odes, and the one who influenced A. von Harnack, was Hubert Grimme, *Die Oden Salomos, Syrisch-Hebräisch-Deutsch: Ein kritischer Versuch* (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1911). The most recent defender of this position is J. Carmignac, who connects the hypothesis of the Hebrew composition of the Odes with the theory that they were written by a converted Qumran monk ("Les affinités qumrâniennes de la onziéme Ode de Salomon," *Revue de Qumran*, III [1961], 71-102; *idem*, "Recherches sur la langue originelle des Odes de Salomon," *Revue de Qumran*, IV [1963-64], 429-32). Baumgartner's rather complex suggestion that the extant Syriac text of the Odes was made from a Greek translation of a Semitic original is supported by S. Schulz, "Salomo-Oden," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, V, 1339. In a significant article entitled "Die ursprüngliche Sprache der Salomo-Oden," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LII (1961), 141-56, Alfred Adam defends the Aramaic origin of the Odes. Adam first of all disqualifies attempts by Connolly and others to clarify difficult or impossible phrases in the Syriac text by translating them back into Greek. All such attempts, claims Adam, are based on pure hypothesis. Adam thereby disqualifies an effective cumulative argument for the Greek origin of the Odes on an *a priori* basis. Not only does Adam fail to demonstrate his theory of a Semitic original behind the extant Greek text of Ode 11, but he also relies much too heavily on the equivocal evidence presented by the Coptic version of the five Odes found in the Pistis Sophia. After pointing out examples of usages not characteristic of Greek in the Bodmer version of Ode 11, Adam admits: "Zu diesem Tatbestand treten einige weitere Merkmale, die zum mindesten auf ein semitisch gefärbtes Griechisch hinweisen . . ."

Since the publication of Ode 11 Greek,[1] the primary task of concerned scholarship has been directed toward the task of determining the linguistic relationship between the Greek and Syriac texts.[2] While the hypothesis of a Greek original has yet to be substantiated in a decisive way,[3] we must tentatively conclude that the Odes were in fact composed in Greek,[4] but in a milieu in

(*Ibid.*, p. 151). His second line of argument is concerned with demonstrating the hypothesis that the Coptic Odes translated by the author of the Pistis Sophia from a Semitic original. However, the differences between the Syriac and the Coptic Odes is an extremely problematic area which has given rise to a number of divergent theories. Harnack accounted for the differences by tracing them back to different recensions of a Greek original. Schulthess explained the same phenomena by theorizing that the Syriac and Coptic translators used the same Greek recension but made different errors in translation. Grimme concluded that a text in Biblical Hebrew lies behind both the Syriac and Coptic versions of the Odes. The difficulties are further compounded by the probability of cross-fertilization between the Odes and their midrashic expansions in the Pistis Sophia; cf. J. Carmignac, "La genre litteraire du 'pesher' dans la Pistis-Sophia," *Revue de Qumran*, IV (1963-64), 497-522.

[1] M. Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer X-XII*; *X*: *Correspondance apocryphe des Corinthiens et de l'apôtre Paul*; *XI*: *Onzième Ode de Salomon*; *XII*: *Fragment d'un Hymne liturgique* (Cologny-Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1959).

[2] M. Philonenko has correctly emphasized this methodology and exemplifies it in his article, "Conjecture sur un verset de la onzième Ode de Salomon," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LII (1962), 264.

[3] The article by Philonenko (cf. *supra*, p. 168, n. 2) is one of the few attempts to vindicate the hypothesis of a Greek Vorlage by means of a careful critical comparison of the Greek and the Syriac texts of Ode 11. Philonenko's theory that the Syriac translator misread the Greek of Ode 11:21 has been rejected by Carmignac ("Recherches sur la langue originelle des Odes de Salomon," pp. 429-32). Yet another line of argumentation which would support the hypothesis of a Greek Vorlage is the strophic structure and rhetorical form exhibited in the Greek version of Ode 11. One of the peculiarities of Papyrus Bodmer XI which has been amply noted by M. Testuz is the use of from one to three verticle strokes to indicate (presumably) the ends of stichoi and strophes. The most striking feature of this structure is the preponderant occurrrence of assonance at the ends of stichoi. Of the forty-eight stichoi indicated in the text of Ode 11, twenty-seven end with the diphthong -ου, two adjoining stichoi terminate with the ending -ης, and four adjoining stichoi terminate with the ending -ων. The frequency of this feature of Gorgianic style utilized by writers influenced by Asianic rhetoric in Asia minor (including such documents as IV Maccabees, the Letters of Ignatius and the Paschal Homily of Melito of Sardis; cf. Perler, "Das vierte Makkabäerbuch," pp. 47-72; H. Riesenfeld, "Reflections on the Style and the Theology of St. Ignatius of Antioch," *Texte und Untersuchungen*, LXXIX [1961], 312-22), should provide the impetus for further investigation of the rhetorical features of the Greek version of Ode 11.

[4] A. F. J. Klijn expresses this conclusion in very emphatic language: "Die Schwierigkeiten scheinen gelöst zu sein, nachdem kürzlich eine der Hymnen in griechischer Sprache gefunden wurde. Ein Vergleich zwischen

which Asianic rhetoric and Semitic poetics had a strong influence on Greek style.[1] Important as the solution of this linguistic question is, it does not materially contribute to the more pressing historical questions which the Odes raise.

The Historical Question

To a large extent the Odes of Solomon share the conceptual world of the Fourth Gospel and the Letters of Ignatius.[2] Whether the Odist knew John in a literary way or whether their relationship is the result of their origin in a common religious and historical milieu cannot be decided with any degree of certainty.[3] If the Odist knew the Fourth Gospel, he did not directly quote it.[4] While this might seem to indicate that the Odes and the Fourth Gospel originated in the same milieu but were nevertheless literarily

---

dem griechischen und syrischen Text lässt beinahe mit Sicherheit erkennen, dass diese Hymnen in griechischer Sprache verfasst wurden" (*Edessa*, p. 45). Klijn expresses this conviction with more reserve in *The Acts of Thomas: Introduction, Text, Commentary* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. V; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962), pp. 46f.

[1] Arguments for the Semitic origin of the Odes cannot be limited to the recognition of their oriental style, rhythm and rhetoric. Gunkel, who supports a Greek original, notes that the Odes are composed in "einer hebräische Dichtungen nachahmenden Form" in his article "Die Oden Salomos," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XI (1910), 293. The same sentiment is expressed by Martin Dibelius, *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936), p. 251: "Even in the original Greek the form of the Odes was obviously Oriental, i.e. an exalted rhythmic style of speech, but not Greek metrical poetry in verse."

[2] *Supra*, pp. 23ff. Cf. also Grant, "The Odes of Solomon and the Church of Antioch," pp. 363-77; Adam, *Die Zeit der alten Kirche*, p. 142; Kümmel *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 175; A. H. McNeile, *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, rev. C. S. C. Williams (2nd ed.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1953), p. 282 (here McNeile includes Polycarp within this conceptual milieu; cf. *supra*, p. 165).

[3] W. von Loewenich, *Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert* (Beheifte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, Nr. 13; Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1932), p. 114.

[4] Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 132, is convinced of the dependence of the Odist on the Fourth Gospel despite the lack of explicit quotation. He finds this necessary because he not only places the origin of John in Antioch (the probable home of the Odes), but also dates the Gospel considerably earlier in the first century than most critics. J. H. Bernard, *The Odes of Solomon* (Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature, Vol. VIII, No. 3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), p. 31, also supports the dependence of the Odist on the Fourth Gospel.

independent,[1] the vague and allusive way in which early Christian literature quotes or alludes to New Testament documents would tend to cut the validity of that line of argument.[2] At any rate, points of contact with the Fourth Gospel include the common use of such concepts or images as "Word," "grace," "faith," "knowledge," "truth," "light," "love," "life," and "living water." Whether or not these concepts have the same meaning in both documents is a more difficult question.[3]

Most of these concepts also have a prominent place in the Letters of Ignatius, a Christian bishop from Antioch in Syria whose polished Hellenistic veneer concealed deep substrata of eastern Christianity. The church historian Socrates recorded a tradition that Ignatius, after having seen a vision of angels praising the Trinity by the use of antiphonal hymns, wrote similar hymns himself and taught others to do so as well.[4] Despite the obviously aetiological nature of this tradition, the hypothesis that the Odes of Solomon were composed by a prominent member of the Syrian church has a large measure of intrinsic probability. Syria is certainly their place of origin,[5] a fact which is confirmed both by the close relationship between the Odes and other early Christian literature from Syria [6] and by the Jewish orientation of the conceptual world of the Christianity expressed in the Odes.[7]

---

[1] J. Rendel Harris, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon: Now First Published from the Syriac Version* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), p. 96.

[2] Cf. Grant, *The Formation of the New Testament*, p. 98.

[3] For example, F.-M. Braun, "L'énigme des Odes de Salomon," *Revue Thomiste*, LVII (1957), 616, points out that in Odes 6:7 and 30:1-2, living water represents inner knowledge, whereas for the Fourth Evangelist it signified the Spirit (John 7:39). This distinction, however, falls to the ground upon closer examination (cf. *infra*, p. 183, n. 2).

[4] Socrates *Hist. eccl.* 6. 8.

[5] If the Odes were written in Greek (as we have tentatively concluded), Antioch is the probable place of origin; if they were composed in Syriac, then Edessa is more probable. While Greek dominated Antioch, Syriac dominated the country districts of Syria in the Seleucid era; cf. W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilization* (3rd ed.; Meridian Books; Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1961), p. 160. Greek was also spoken in Edessa, though Syriac was probably the language of the Christian church there; cf. Klijn, *Edessa*, p. 45). F. C. Burkitt claims that Syriac was completely dominant in Edessa (*Early Eastern Christianity* London: John Murray, 1904, p. 10).

[6] *Supra*, pp. 25f.

[7] The origin of the Syrian church, now a matter of great scholarly concern (cf. *supra*, p. 24, n. 1), is intimately connected with the spread of the gospel

Whether or not the conceptual world of the Odes with their obviously syncretistic or proto-Gnostic traits should be designated "Gnostic" or eastern "Vulgärchristentum" is a semantic as well as a historical and methodological problem. The earlier verdict expressed by some scholars that the Odes reflected a Judaizing Gnosticism has found new support through the discovery of the Evangelium Veritatis among the Coptic Gnostic literature from Nag Hammadi.[1] After a brief comparison of parallels between the Evangelium Veritas and the Odes, H.-M. Schenke concludes that the authors of both documents were members of the same Gnostic circle.[2] In the same vein, R. M. Grant has characterized the Odes as "Valentinian." [3] Despite the undeniable conceptual congruity which certainly exists between the Odes and the Evangelium Veritatis, one must question the wisdom of classifying either document as "Gnostic," unless the term is used in such a comprehensive and expansive sense as to render it meaningless.[4]

---

by Jewish Christianity (cf. Klijn, *Edessa*, pp. 31ff.). Individual motifs such as the *descensus ad infernum* and the ascension, which are found greatly developed in later Gnosticism (cf. Dibelius, *A Fresh Approach*, p. 240), were also of great importance in Jewish Christianity. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* by Jean Daniélou is, in our opinion, a very succesful attempt to demonstrate this.

[1] Earlier scholars who characterized the Odes as "Gnostic" include H. Gunkel, H. Gressmann, E. Preuschen, G. Krüger, J. Wellhausen, C. Clemen, F. Buhl, H. Duensing, M. Sprengling, W. Stölten, E. Hora and R. Reitzenstein. More recently this position has been maintained by R. Bultmann, H. Schlier, H. Lewy, H. Jonas, W. Bauer, S. Schulz and K. Rudolph.

[2] H.-M. Schenke, *Die Herkunft des sogennanten Evangelium Veritatis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), p. 29: "Aus dem dargebotenen Material ist nur ein Schluss möglich: Das sog. EV entstammt einem gnostischen Kreise, dem auch der Verfasser der Od. Sal. angehört." Cf. E. Segelberg, "Evangelium Veritatis—A Confirmation Homily and Its Relation to the Odes of Solomon," *Orientalia Suecana*, VIII (1959), 3-42.

[3] Robert M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (rev. ed.; Harper Torchbooks; New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966), p. 169. On the relationship between the Evangelium Veritatis and Valentinianism, see G. Quispel, "The Jung Codex and Its Significance," *The Jung Codex: A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus*, ed. and trans. F. L. Cross (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1955), p. 50: "our *Gospel of truth* is very old and must have been written about A. D. 150, presumably by Valentinus himself." Cf. W. C. van Unnik, "The 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament," *The Jung Codex: A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus*, ed. and trans. F. L. Cross (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1955), p. 99: "The author of the Gospel of Truth was Valentinus himself."

[4] While Walter Bauer regards the Odes as Gnostic hymns, he soon qualifies his judgment by stating that "*Gnostisch* ist dabei in einem weiten Sinne

Not only are the typical Gnostic speculations on cosmology and dualism entirely absent,[1] but the positive doctrine of God as the creator of the material world is frequently mentioned (Odes 4:15; 7:9, 24; 12:10; 16:5-19).[2] Then too, the doctrine of redemption expressed in the Odes is not the discovery or recognition of the authentic self, but is rather based on the mercy and grace of the divine will.[3] While the affirmation that the heavenly world is the only real world (found in Ode 34:4 and Evangelium Veritatis 17:18-25) [4] is certainly an emphasis of second century Gnosticism, although its value as a parallel is diminished by the fact that it is a widespread phenomenon in the history of religions.[5] We must conclude that while elements of Gnosis are present in the Odes, they cannot be categorized meaningfully as "Gnostic." [6]

There is general agreement that the Odes exhibit an early variety of "Jewish Christianity," by which we mean a variety of Christianity whose thought-forms and modes of conceptualization are largely drawn from late Judaism.[7] Recognizing the fact that the evidence for the Gnostic character of the Odes is not at all strong, J. de Zwaan suggests the alternative of eastern "Vulgärchristentum." [8] While the origins of this popular eastern Christianity are shrouded in obscurity (the Odes may be its earliest literary

---

zu fassen" ("Die Oden Salomos," *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, ed. Edgar Hennecke und Wilhelm Schneemelcher, II [3. Aufl.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964], 577).

[1] Distinctions between the Odes and Gnosticism properly so-called are frequently noted by scholars who defend the Gnostic character of the Odes. Cf. R. Abramowski, "Der Christus der Salomooden," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXV (1936), 45; Kurt Rudolph, "War der Verfasser der Oden Salomos ein 'Qumran-Christ'?: ein Beitrag zur Diskussion um die Anfänge der Gnosis," *Revue de Qumran*, IV (1936), 526.

[2] Closely related to the thought of God as creator of the material world is the fact that praise is forthcoming, not only from man, but also from the second heaven of sun, moon and stars (Odes 7:24; 16:15-17; 12:4-11). In Ode 20:1-2 the Odist distinguishes three kinds of thought, that of God, the created world and man.

[3] Cf. Braun, "L'énigme des Odes de Salomon," pp. 611f. The Odes contain a strong emphasis on grace: 4:6; 5:3; 6:6; 7:10, 22, 25; 9:5; 11:1; 15:8; 20:7; 21:1; 23:2; 25:4; 33:1, 10.

[4] Schenke, *Die Herkunft des sogennanten Evangelium Veritatis*, p. 28.

[5] Cf. Eliade, *Cosmos and History*, p. 92.

[6] *Supra*, p. 26. n. 5.

[7] Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, pp. 9f. This definition is disputed by H. J. Schoeps, *Jewish Christianity*, trans. Douglas R. A. Hare (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), p. 9, n. 2.

[8] De Zwaan, "The Edessene Origin of the Odes of Solomon," p. 289.

representative), its early connections with Jewish Christianity is assured.[1] While many of the motifs and images appearing in the Odes may be considered Gnostic, these same motifs and images may equally well (or better, in my opinion) be explained from the standpoint of a Christianity influenced by heterodox Judaism. Points of contact between the literature of Qumran and the Odes were first noted by J. Daniélou, F.-M. Braun and M. Testuz; J. Carmignac has defended the theory that the Odes were written by a Qumran monk converted to Christianity.[2] While many of the parallels between the Ḥodayoth and the Odes are striking, F.-M. Braun has demonstrated that any hypothesis of direct genetic relationship is untenable.[3] The congruities between the Odes and the Dead Sea Scrolls lead no further than the substantiation of the general assertion that the conceptual world of the Odes of Solomon is that of eastern "Vulgärchristentum" strongly impressed by Judaism.

In summary, it can be said that the Odes of Solomon were probably composed in Greek at Antioch (if in Syriac, then at Edessa), by one who was at home in a Jewish Christian religious context. The undeniable syncretistic or proto-Gnostic elements which occasionally emerge in the Odes is a phenomenon which was deeply rooted in Syrian Christianity before "orthodoxy" was rigidly distinguished from "heterodoxy." The primitive theology

[1] The primitive (heterodox) theology of the Odes points to an origin prior to the polarization of "orthodoxy" and "heterodoxy" into mutually exclusive entities; cf. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*, pp. 6-48.

[2] Carmignac, "Un Qumrânien converti au Christianisme," pp. 75-108. Noting that Ode 5:1 begins with the same initial phrase as each of Qumran Ḥodayoth ("I give thanks to thee, O Lord, for . . ."), Carmignac concludes that "la présence d'un tel 'incipit,' unique dans l'Ancien Testament, inconnu dans le Judaisme, fréquent à Qumrân, conservé chez les Qaraites, ne peut pas être considérée comme un simple hasard" (*Ibid.*, p. 80). The incorrectness of Carmignac's conclusion is revealed in the penetrating study by James M. Robinson, "Die Hodajot-Formel in Gebet und Hymnus des Frühchristentums," *Apophoreta, Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen* (Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, Nr. 30; Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1964), pp. 194-235. Günther Morawe has demonstrated (in my opinion) that the Thanksgiving Hymns in the Odes of Solomon show no specially close relationship to the Qumran Ḥodayoth apart from demonstrating a very late stage of development ("Vergleich des Aufbaus der Danklieder und hymnischen Bekenntnislieder [1 QH] von Qumran mit dem Aufbau der Psalmen im Alten Testament und im Spätjudentum," *Revue de Qumran*, IV [1936], 347).

[3] Braun, "L'énigme des Odes de Salomon," pp. 598-605; cf. O. Betz, *Der Paraklet* (Leiden: E. J. Brilll, 1963), p. 215.

of the Odes, together with their strong emphasis on the charismatic,[1] locates them within the period from A. D. 90 to 150, probably ca. A. D. 120.[2] Beyond these tentative conclusions, the most important riddle posed by the Odes has yet to be treated. From what setting in the life of the Syrian church did the Odes arise? Unless the Odes are interpreted in the light of their original historical, religious and cultic context, the correct evaluation of the ways in which they conceptualize eschatological salvation will be impossible.

The Cultic Setting of the Odes

The Odes of Solomon constitute a homogenous collection of Christian hymns put into final form by a single author-editor.[3] While some have suggested that they were private mystical hymns expressing the piety of a single unknown individual,[4] others have

[1] *Infra*, pp. 177ff.

[2] Leone Tondelli, *Le Odi di Salomone: Cantici Christiani degli inizi del II Secolo* (Rome: Franscesco Ferrari, 1914), p. 134: "In cifre si assegneranno quindi come limiti estremi gli anni 90-150; verso il 120 sembra col Batiffol porsi la data più probabile." Most scholars would agree with the outer limits posed by Tondelli. Those who place the Odes after A. D. 150 generally do so for very tenuous reasons. F.-M. Braun, for example, places the Odes in the last quarter of the second century because of his theory that they were written by Bardaisan (A. D. 154-222). J. de Zwaan places their composition after the beginning of the third century because he sees a historical reference in Ode 4 to the destruction by flood of the Edessan church about that time.

[3] Harnack claimed that the Odes were Jewish compositions revised and interpolated by a Christian redactor before the end of the first century. The first decisive refutation of this theory was offered by R. H. Connolly, "The Odes of Solomon: Jewish or Christian?" *Journal of Theological Studies*, XIII (1911-12), 298-309. Conolly demonstrated that many of the supposedly Christian interpolations exhibited traits which cohered with what Harnack supposed to be the uninterpolated Jewish original. A more comprehensive defense of the unity of the Odes was published a few years later by Gerhard Kittel, *Die Oden Salomos: überarbeitet oder einheitlich?* The homogeneity of the Odes is currently a presupposition shared by virtually all concerned scholars; cf. the remarks of Quasten, *Patrology*, I, 161: "The unity of style which the Odes exhibit is a decisive argument against any supposition of Jewish origin and Christian interpolation."

[4] Wilhelm Frankenberg, *Das Verständnis der Oden Salomos* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Nr. 21; Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1911), p. 4: "Sie die Oden sind ein rein literarisches Produkt, ihr Schauplatz ist nirgends die 'grosse' Welt, sondern stets die einzelne Seele mit ihren Kämpfen und Erfahrungen, das Publikum des Sprechers in den Oden ist die *ekklēsia* in ihrem mystischen Sinn. Davon dass sie für den Gemeindegottesdienst, wenigstens ursprünglich, berechnet

concluded that they comprise a psalter designed to be sung within some kind of liturgical context,[1] as the frequency of plural imperatives and the acclamation "Hallelujah!" which is appended to each Ode (with the exception of the first), seems to suggest.

One of the most penetrating discussions of the Odes of Solomon along this line has been the study by R. Abramowski, "Der Christus der Salomooden." Following the lead of H. Gunkel's *Gattungsforschung* on the Biblical psalms,[2] Abramowski set out to classify the Odes according to their literary *Gattungen*. He distinguishes three basic types of Odes: (1) *Lehrdichtungen*, (2) *Gemeindelieder* and (3) *Individualoden*.[3] Since the final classification comprehends more than two-thirds of the collection, Abramowski focuses on them and inquires who the "I" of these *Individualoden* could be.[4]

---

sind, zeigt sich nirgends eine deutliche Spur, vom Gegenteile viele." M. Dibelius (*A Fresh Approach*, p. 250), similarly suggests that some of the Odes may have been private poety, e.g., Ode 17. The mystical character of the Odes has also been stressed by E. A. Abbott, *Light on the Gospel from an Ancient Poet* (Diatessarica, Pt. IX; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), pp. 11, 97. He claims that the Odes reveal that Jewish mysticism has been transformed into a Christian mysticism.

[1] Tondelli, *Le Odi di Salomone*, pp. 128-32, concluded that the Odes were designed to be sung in a congregation, but without a more precise liturgical context than that. J. H. Bernard interpreted the Odes as Christian baptismal hymns intended for use in public worship, either for catechumens or for those recently baptized (*The Odes of Solomon*, pp. 3f., 42). Bernard's solution has not commended itself to scholars generally. The primary weakness in Bernard's hypothesis is that not all (or even a majority) of the Odes can be pressed into service as baptismal hymns. The numerous allusions to baptism hardly proves that the hymns originated in baptismal liturgy (Quasten, *Patrology*, I, 161). Bernard's theory fails to be convincing because he attempts to apply it everywhere and at all costs. The complex content of the Odes is not amenable to singular explanation. De Zwaan correctly refers to the Odes as a "peculiar mixture of mysticism, baptismal imagery, spiritualized eschatology and personal religious life" ("The Edessene Origin of the Odes of Solomon," p. 297).

[2] Gunkel classified the Odes in a preliminary way himself, and arrived at four main types: (1) *Ich-Psalm*, (2) *Wir-Gebet der Gemeinde*, (3) *Ihr-Predigt*, and (4) *Christi Offenbarungsrede* ("Die Oden Salomos," p. 328). On the last type mentioned, see Becker's analysis of Ode 33:6-13 (*Die Reden des Johannesevangeliums*, p. 18).

[3] Abramowski, "Der Christus der Salomooden," pp. 50ff.

[4] Abramowski stresses the cruciality of this question (*ibid.*, p. 52): "Sind die Oden in dieser Weise geordnet und hat sich ihr Hauptteil als Lieder eines einzelnen feststellen lassen, so ist nun die sich ständig aufdrängende Frage zu beantworten, wer dieser einzelne ist. Ohne die Lösung dieses Problems sind die Oden weder religionsgeschichtlich fruchtbar zu verwenden, noch theologisch auszulegen. Es ist der Angelpunkt im Verständnis der Salomooden."

After differentiating between Christ as *filius proprius* and the Christian as *filius adoptivus*, Abramowski concludes that the second "I" (when the two types can be distinguished)must be a prominent member of the cultic community in which the Odes originated, the "priest" of Ode 20.[1] As for the community standing behind the Odes, Abramowski offers two interpretive possiblities. If the redemption of which the Odes speak is mediated in the present time through the cultus, then we are dealing with an actual community, a church. If, however, the redemption spoken of is an eschatological reality, the community would be one which is invisible at the present time and would only be manifested at the eschaton. He concludes that the redemption reflected in the Odes is sacramentally mediated through the cultus within an actual religious community.[2]

The phenomenon of the frequent and almost imperceptible shift from the Christian to Christ as the speaker standing behind the "I" of the *Individualoden* underlines the prophetic character of the Odes.[3] The Odes contain a rather strong emphasis on the divine inspiration of the Odist with the consequent authentication of the divine origin of the message.[4] In Ode 16:5, for example, the Odist says, "I will open my mouth, and his Spirit will utter through me the glory of the Lord." In Ode 6:1-2, we find the following statement: "As the hand moves over the harp and the

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 58f.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 60f.

[3] The relative frequency of Dominical sayings in the first person singular in early Christian literature (many of which, for one reason or another, fail to meet the tests of authenticity) underlines the important and creative role played by early Christian prophets in the cult of the early Christian communities. They were to be regarded "as the Lord" (Didache 4:1f.; 11:1f.; cf. Ign. Eph. 6:1), and spoke with divine authority. Referring to Mark 13:6, 22 (a warning against false christs and false prophets placed in the mouth of Jesus), Vielhauer remarks that "the polemic against Christian false prophets shows that in the region in which our oldest Gospel originated, Palestine and Syria, the problem of distinguishing between true and false prophets was a real one. Now form-critical analysis of the Synoptic tradition permits us to recognize the work of Christian prophets in the older strata of the tradition, that is, in earlier periods and in the Palestinian neighborhood." Since all of the early Christian literature upon which the present study is based have close ties with Syria, the appropriateness of Vielhauer's remarks is evident. The presence of Jesus in the midst of the community assembled for worship is emphasized in Matt. 18:19-20, and seems to lie behind the enigmatical references to Jesus' "coming" in the Farewell Discourses of the Fourth Gospel (*supra*, pp. 126-33).

[4] Braun, "L'énigme des Odes de Salomon," p. 621.

strings speak, so speaks in my members the Spirit of the Lord, and I speak by his love." And again we read in Ode 26:10, "Who can rest on the Most High, that with his mouth he may speak?" A similar connection between the possession of the Spirit of God and the ability to praise is found in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QH 3:21-23).

It would be difficult to find a more suitable designation for these hymns than the term ᾠδαὶ πνευματικαί, which Paul uses for charismatic hymns of praise uttered within the context of worship (Col. 3:16).[1] In Eph. 5:18b-19, a member of the Pauline circle connects this term even more closely with inspired utterance: "Be filled with the Spirit, addressing one another in psalms and and hymns and spiritual odes, singing with praise in your hearts to the Lord." If, with Abramowski, we place the Odes of Solomon within the context of a worshipping community, what does the emphasis which the Odist places on divine inspiration and pneumatic illumination contribute to our understanding of the Odes? [2]

Within the New Testament, prophets and prophecy are given a place of central importance within the worshipping community.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Delling, *Worship in the New Testament*, p. 87.

[2] One of the beneficial results of the abortive attempt to prove the Montanist origin of the Odes was the emphasis which was placed on the element of prophetic inspiration, and the location of that inspired utterance within the setting of a Montanist worship service. The Montanist revival of Jewish eschatology (cf. Tertullian *De pud.* 8. 9: "Christianum enim de restitutione Iudaei gaudere et non dolere conueniet, siquidem tota spes nostra cum reliqua Israelis expectatione coniuncta est.") and of primitive forms of worship was undoubtly a genuine attempt to institute change in existing church order and theological priorities by reverting back to what was considered to be a more primitive emphasis. It is perhaps worth noting that the imagery of the Odes which compares a man to a lyre and the Spirit to a plectrum (Odes 6:1; 14:8; 26:3; 7:17), was also used by the Montanists (Epiphanius *Panarion* 48. 4. 1). The Montanist origin of the Odes was suggested by F. C. Conybeare, "The Odes of Solomon Montanist," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XII (1911), 70-75, and S. A. Fries, "*Die* Oden Salomos: montanistische Lieder aus dem 2. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XII (1911), 108-25.

[3] For the Pauline communities, cf. I Cor. 14:1-5, 23-32, 39. In the Johannine Apocalypse, according to Delling (*Worship in the New Testament*, pp. 159ff.), the prophets appear as the men who determine the worshipping life of the church. On this whole question see Lindblom, *Gesichte und Offenbarungen*; H. A. Guy, *New Testament Prophecy: Its Origin and Significance* (London: The Epworth Press, 1947). Cf. C. F. D. Moule, *Worship in the New Testament* (Ecumenical Studies in Worship, No. 9; Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1961), p. 63, where Moule stresses worship context of the prophetic utterance recorded in Acts 13:2. Bultmann, *Theology of*

In the narrative of the Book of Acts, Judas and Silas, prophets from Antioch, functioned in community gatherings (Acts 15:30).[1] Prophecy certainly was an important feature of cultic worship in the Pauline communties (I Cor. 14:1-5, 23-32, 39).[2] In fact, every aspect of worship was regarded as a work of the Spirit of God, and consequently as an anticipation of and participation in the heavenly worship of God.[3] The seer of the Johannine Apocalypse claimed that he was "in the Spirit" on the Lord's Day (Rev. 1:10), an ecstatic experience which may well have occurred within the setting of congregational worship.[4] The seer also conceptualizes the heavenly worship of God as parallel to earthly worship,[5] thereby enabling the Christian community assembled

the New Testament, I, 161, underscores the importance of prophecy in the early church: "... *the workings of the Spirit are experienced above all in the service of worship*, in which the eschatological congregation takes present form. It understands everything that is given it here as the gift of the Spirit, especially what transcends the ordinary—the word of instruction, which dispenses wisdom and knowledge, as well as prophecy, which uncovers the mystery of future events but which also reveals what lurks in the heart—prayers and songs and especially ecstatic speaking in tongues."

[1] Thompson, "The Form and Function of Hymns in the New Testament," p. 190, n. 1, suggests that Agabus, mentioned in Acts 11:28, also functioned in a cultic setting because of the fact that the text reads that he "stood up" prior to uttering his prophecy of world-wide famine.

[2] Cf. Armin Dietzel, "Beten im Geist: ein religionsgeschichtliche Parallele aus der Hodayoth zum paulinischer Gebet im Geist," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, XIII (1957), 12-32.

[3] One clear indication of the correctness of this statement is the conception of the presence of angelic beings in cultic worship in the Qumran community (*supra*, p. 32, n. 2), the Pauline communities (I Cor. 11:10; 13:1), the Johannine community (John 1:51; cf. *supra*, pp. 96ff.), and the community out of which the Odes of Solomon arose (Ode 36:4: "I praised among the praising ones, and great was I among the mighty ones."). According to Erik Peterson, "Alle Kulthandlungen der Kirche wären dann entweder als eine Teilnahme der Engel am irdischen Kult, oder umgekehrt, aller irdische Kult der Kirche wäre als ein Teilnehmen an dem Kult, der God in Himmel von den Engel dargebracht wird, zu verstehen" (*Das Buch von den Engeln*, pp. 17f.).

[4] Delling, *Worship in the New Testament*, pp. 44ff.; Willy Rordorf, *Der Sonntag: Geschichte des Ruhe- und Gottesdiensttages im ältesten Christentum* (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Bd. 43; Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1962), p. 212; Ernst Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Bd. 16; 2nd ed;. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953), p. 15. The possibility that the Johannine seer may have received his revelation within the setting of worship is not surprising in view of the fact that ἀποκάλυψις was a characteristic feature of Christian worship (cf. I Cor. 14:26).

[5] Otto Piper, "The Apocalypse of St. John and the Liturgy of the Ancient Church," *Church History*, XX (1951), 153-68; Pierre Prigent, *Apocalypse*

for worship to encounter a proleptic experience of worshipping God in the presence of heavenly angelic beings in Paradise. The hymns of the Apocalypse, not unlike the Odes of Solomon, may be considered liturgical hymns, formal in style, yet freely composed and transposed from the earthly to the heavenly realm by the seer.[1] In the Odes of Solomon, we find frequent references to the heavenly journies of the Odist (together with his congregation),[2] where the object of the journey is the charismatic praise of God: "from above he gave me rest in incorruption . . . and carried me to his Paradise . . . and I worshipped the Lord on account of his glory" (Ode 11:10, 14-15).[3] In Ode 36:1-2, the Odist says,

et Liturgie (Cahiers Théologiques, No. 52; Paris: Delachaux et Niestle, 1964), pp. 14-45; Thompson, "The Form and Function of Hymns in the New Testament," pp. 168-210 (chapter entitled "Temple Hymnody and Early Christian Singing"); Peterson, *Das Buch von den Engeln*, pp. 37-8. In an article entitled "Worship in NT Times, Christian," C. C. Richardson suggests (in line with the authors cited above) that in Rev. 4-6 the seer has caste his vision in forms derived from Christian liturgy: "The throne would be the bishop's chair; the seats of the elders would be those of the presbyters on either side of the bishop; the lamb would be the consecrated bread and wine; the book would be the gospel MS; some of the refrains might reflect Christian hymns . . ." (*Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, IV, 887). Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, p. 7, sees earthly worship as a counterpart to heavenly worship: ". . . he [John] sees the whole drama of the last days in the context of the early Christian service of worship which, so to speak, has its counterpart and at the same time its fulfilment in the coming aeon, so that all that takes place in the gatherings of the early Christian community, seen from this side, appears as an anticipation of that which in the last day takes place from God's side." Delling, *Worship in the New Testament*, p. 45, is more hesitant than Cullmann and Thompson in drawing conclusions about earthly worship from the heavenly liturgy of the Apocalypse.

[1] Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, pp. 21f.; Thompson, "The Form and Function of Hymns in the New Testament," pp. 65-108.

[2] While the "Himmelfahrt" can be a Gnostic motif, here it must be interpreted against the background of Jewish apocalyptic and early Jewish Christian prophecy. In the Odes, as in the Qumran community (*supra*, pp. 33, n. 1, 37-42) this is probably a communal rather than individual experience.

[3] A particularly striking example of the realization of one's presence in community in Paradise within the confines of cultic worship is found in Epiphanius' account of the Adamites in *Panarion* 52. 1. 1 to 52. 3. 8. Considering the interior of their heated church to be Paradise and themselves as counterparts to Adam and Eve in their primal state, during the service the worshippers removed their clothes for the duration. Whatever historical antecedents the Adamites may have had, their conception of eschatological salvation as a restoration of primal conditions is closely related to Jewish Christianity.

> I rested on the Spirit of the Lord, and the Spirit raised me on high and made me stand on my feet in the height of the Lord, before his perfection and glory, while I was praising him by the composition of his songs.

The Didache and the Shepherd of Hermas, both of which have a strongly Jewish Christian orientation, provide us with important clues to the kinds of relationships which existed between early Christian prophets and congregations.[1] In the Didache, which was probably compiled in the latter part of the first century in Syria-Palestine, we learn that itinerant Christian prophets may settle among the people, who are to present them with their first-fruits, since they are to be regarded as high priests (Did. 13:1-4; cf. Ode 20). This reveals the significant position which they occupied in the cult. The ministry of prophets and teachers was not strictly limited to travelling charismatics, but could also be carried on by bishops and deacons (Did. 15:1-2),[2] True prophets are to be received as the Lord himself (Did. 4:1-2; 11:1-2), because they convey the word of God (4:1).

In the Shepherd of Hermas we discover that the prophet is normally seated on a chair before a group on benches (*Mand.* 11. 1). False prophets are those who must be spurred on with questions and who tend to avoid congregations (*Mand.* 11. 13). True prophets speak out only at the instigation of the divine (*Mand.* 11. 5), and that within a communal context (*Mand.* 11. 9).[3] The last passage deserves to be quoted in full:

[1] According to J. Massingberd Ford, "Hermas appears to have been a Jewish-Christian prophet performing his work in the liturgical gatherings of the Christian community, which show a resemblance of I Cor. 11-14 with respect to prophecy, interpretation, revelation, teaching" ("A Possible Liturgical Background to the Shepherd of Hermas," *Revue de Qumran*, VIII [1969], 531).

[2] Referring to this passage, Dibelius notes that while bishops and deacons were first appointed for such practical services as charity and money matters, they were beginning to take a more active part in Christian worship in place of prophets and teachers (*A Fresh Approach*, p. 236). Cf. Rudolf Knopf, "Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel," *Die apostolischen Väter* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Ergänzungsband; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923), p. 37.

[3] In his book, *Prophētēs: Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1927), p. 189, Erich Fascher observes that "'προφητεύειν' nach christlicher Auffassung ist die gottbegeisterte Rede vor der Gemeinde, aber nicht eine privat erteilte Auskunft." Fascher finds that the root of the Christian conception of prophecy is the community and is therefore to be seen against the background of the Old Testament. This is precisely the thesis of Lindblom, *Gesichte und Offenbarungen*. In Fascher's view, the false prophets described by Hermas have a strong Hellenistic element of individualism.

> Therefore, when the man who has the divine Spirit comes into a meeting of righteous men who have the faith of the divine Spirit, and intercession is made to God from the assembly of those men, then the angel of the prophetic Spirit rests on him and fills the man, and the man, being filled with the holy Spirit, speaks to the congregation as the Lord wills.

We can now summarize the kind of relationship between a prophet and a worshipping congregation: (1) the prophet occupies a position of prominence in the local congregation, in spite of the fact that he may be an itinerant charismatic,[1] (2) when the community assembled for worship, the prophet is given a seat before the congregation, (3) those present pray that God will speak to them through his messenger (cf. Odes 4:10; 14:7-9; 37:1-4), (4) the prophet is then filled with the Spirit of God, and (5) he speaks to the congregation the revelatory word of God.

Although the Didache and the Shepherd of Hermas, as well as many other remnants of early Christian literature, were not intended to supply modern scholars with exact information regarding the cultic worship of the early Christian communities, we must nevertheless ask the question, Why is there no mention in either of these two documents of the cultic experience of being lifted to the heavenly presence of God within the setting of Christian worship? It must first of all be recognized that although Christian worship is the setting in which past and future coalesce into the present cultic experience, that realization or actualization of protology and/or eschatology could take one of two forms: (1) the prophet and/or the cultic community could view themselves as being eschatologically transported to the heavenly realms, or (2) the prophet and/or the worshipping community could conceptualize the realities of eschatological salvation as present in earthly worship.[2]

In the Didache, the second of these alternative modes of conceptualizing the present realization of eschatological salvation is preferred. In Didache 4:1-2, we read:

> My child, you will remember day and night the one who speaks the word of God to you, and you will honor him as the Lord. For

[1] After his conversion in Palestine, Peregrinus was called both a προφήτης and a θιασάρχης, or leader of a religious association (Lucian *De morte Peregrini* 11). Peregrinus roamed about and may have consciously adopted the garb of a prophet (*ibid.*, 15f.).

[2] *Supra*, p. 96. Cf. Peterson, *Das Buch von den Engeln*, pp. 17f.

> where the Lord's nature is spoken of, there he is present. And you will daily seek the presence of the saints, that you might find rest [ἐπαναπαῇς] in their words.

Here the prophetic or charismatic leader of the community mediates the presence of God in the cultic worship of the community. The entire congregation becomes a charismatic vehicle for the word of God, and the result of listening to these divine words is "rest." Here ἐπαναπαύεσθαι is not synonymous with "comfort," "encouragement"[1] or "refreshment,"[2] but is rather to be understood as the cultic realization of eschatological salvation conceptualized as primeval rest in Paradise.[3] In the Odes of Solomon, this "rest" is closely connected with both divine inspiration and "Himmelfährten" (Odes 26:10; 36:1-2; 11:12-16). Ode 26:12-13 is a particularly appropriate passage which, like Didache 4:1-2, underlines the communal experience of eschatological rest:[4] "It is sufficient to know and to find rest, for in rest the singers stand, like a river which has an abundant fountain and flows to the aid of those who need it."

To summarize, the Odes of Solomon appear to be a collection of prophetic or charismatic hymns of praise and thanksgiving which were of central importance in the cultic worship of Christian communities in Syria.[5] The Spirit of God is the agent who enables

---

[1] Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 282.

[2] Robert A. Kraft, *Didache and Barnabas*, Vol. III of *The Apostolic Fathers: A Translation and Commentary*, ed. Robert M. Grant (London and New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1965), p. 151.

[3] The word ἀναπαύειν in this compound form is rather rare, but it does occur within a context of realized eschatology in the Gospel of the Hebrews according to Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 5. 14. 96. 3: "He that seeks will not rest until he finds, and he that has found shall marvel, and he that has marvelled shall reign, and he that has reigned shall rest [ἐπαναπαήσεται]." (In *Strom.* 2. 9. 45. 5 this quotation is explicitly attributed to the Gospel of the Hebrews). The use of ἐπαναπαύεσθαι in Barnabas 4:13 in a completely futuristic eschatological sense, parallel to the futuristic eschatology expressed with the synonym καταπαύειν in Barnabas 15-16, can be interpreted as a reaction to the Gnostic use of the term "rest" in a realized sense. In the Letter to the Hebrews, the term καταπαύειν, in addition to being a future eschatological goal, is also capable of present realization (cf. *infra*, p. 190.).

[4] *Infra*, pp. 190ff., for a more detailed discussion of the significance of eschatological rest in the Odes of Solomon.

[5] From the very beginning of the Christian movement, prophets and teachers (not presbyters) had great prominence in Syrian Antioch. In Acts 13:1-3, Antiochian prophets prophecy through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit within a communal context (cf. Acts 11:27; 15:32; 21:10). On this question see Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und*

the cult leader and the congregation to participate in eschatological salvation through the proleptic experience of participating in the future heavenly worship of God within the setting of an earthly community assembled for worship.[1] The participation of the congregation in this experience is demonstrated by the frequent shift from "I" to "we" in the Odes, the characteristic use of plural imperatives and the final "Hallelujah" (Odes 4:9f.; 6:5f.; 17:15; 18:7; 41:2-7, 11; 42:21-24).

The question remains as to whether or not this experience of the present cultic actualization of eschatological salvation is sacramentally mediated, and if so, to what degree. While there is no discernable reference to the eucharist in the Odes, many find baptism reflected in the frequent water imagery.[2] The possibility of a milk

geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, Nr. 14; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953), p. 76. The fact that many lines of evidence points to the importance of Syria-Palestine as a focal area of early Christian prophetic activity taken together with the fact that we know little about the actual role played by the prophets within cultic worship makes the indirect evidence found in the Odes all the more valuable.

[1] Klijn, *Edessa*, p. 46; Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, p. 36: "In Christianity the Spirit is the future which in virtue of the past actualizes itself in the present. This time-character of the Holy Spirit, connecting him with the history of salvation, manifests itself in the very essence of the Christian service, where it is no myth that is represented, but the Christ event of the present is closely bound up with the historical facts of past time and the facts of the last days still in the future." It would rather seem that if the barrier between present and future is broken down within the context of Christian worship, the timeless character of the heavenly world and of the Spirit should be emphasized (cf. Ode 34:4-5; Epistula ad Rheginum 48:13-19; Eliade, *Cosmos and History*, p. 92).

[2] Once we have associated the Odes with prophetic or charismatic hymns used in Christian worship, a strong case can be made out for associating most of the references to water imagery in the Odes with the word of God; cf. Schlier, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, pp. 140-52. That water is in fact used as an image for the word of God is particularly evident in Odes 6:12-17 and 30:1-5. Bernard, *The Odes of Solomon*, p. 114, predictably interprets the latter passage as an invitation to baptism. Tondelli, on the other hand, considers this Ode a decisive refutation of Bernard's theory: "L'ode sembra decisiva anche contro la teoria del Bernard. Le acque non sono un ricordo del Battesimo: esse sono simbolo della parola di vita uscita dalle labbra di Gesù Cristo, ch'egli parla ancora invisibilmente colla sua grazia" (*Le Odi de Salomone*, p. 237), cf. Frankenberg, *Das Verständnis der Oden Salomos*, p. 92. Water is used figuratively in the Odes for revelation in general (Bultmann, "*Zaō*, etc.," p. 840). The word of God is frequently equated with knowledge and expressed through reference to water imagery. Its source is God himself through the instrumentality of his prophet: "my heart poured out as it were a gushing stream of righteousness" (Ode 36:7);

and honey sacrament in the Odist's community is also feasible.[1] If the cult is the setting in which eschatological salvation is mediated to the congregation, and the sacraments constitute an important element of cultic worship, then in accordance with our hypothetical cultic setting for the Odes, the sacraments must be regarded as the presupposition for the realization or actualization of eschatological salvation within the context of worship. However, the sacraments alone do not mediate the experience of worshipping God in his heavenly presence; that eschatological experience is exclusively mediated by the Spirit of God. The sacraments and the Spirit are not antithetical but complimentary so that the salvific experience mediated through the cult is conceptualized through the use of sacramental imagery.

The Cultic Setting of Eschatological Salvation in the Odes

The Jewish Christian character of the Odes of Solomon may be clearly established through an investigation of the ways in which the Odist and his community conceptualized eschatological salvation.[2]

"He has filled me with the words of truth, that I may speak the same, and like the flow of waters flows truth from my mouth, and my lips show forth his fruit" (Ode 12:1-2). The fact that the water of life will be the means of sustaining eternal life (Ode 6:18) is strongly reminiscent of the Johannine Apocalypse (21:6; 22:1, 17). The word of God is not only mediated by the cult leader or prophet, but by members of the congregation as well: "In rest the singers stand, like a river which has an abundant fountain, and flows to the help of them that seek it" (Ode 26:12-13). Ode 7:16-19 is especially relevant here: "And the Most High shall be known in his Saints, to announce to those that have songs of the coming of the Lord, that they may go forth to meet him, and may sing to him with joy and with the harp of many tones. The seers shall come before him and they shall be seen before him, and they shall praise the Lord for his love because he is near and beholds." Here an earthly liturgy in which the prophets play a significant role is oriented about the cultic realization of the Parousia (for this same phenomenon in the cult of the Johannine community, cf. *supra*, pp. 89-101).

The most important parallels to the water-revelation imagery of the Odes is found in Johannine literature (John 4:10f.; 7:37ff.) and in Ignatius (Rom. 7:2). When F.-M. Braun finds similar imagery but different ideas behind the imagery in John and the Odes, he does violence to both documents. While "living water" in Odes 6:7 and 30:1-2 refers to inner knowledge and the same image in John 7:39 refers to the Spirit, both must be considered aspects of the same reality (cf. *supra*, p. 170, n. 3).

[1] Abramowski, "Der Christus der Salomooden," pp. 60f.

[2] Klijn, *Edessa*, p. 50: "Doch kann trotz der Parallelen zu den johanneischen Schriften nicht behauptet werden, dass die Oden als Ganzes aus der Gedankenwelt des Johannes zu erklären seien. Es gibt Berührungspunkte;

Most, if not all, of this imagery is drawn from that constellation of imagery which we have designated as the Paradise motif or tradition.[1] We have found that this motif permeates the conception of eschatological salvation reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls,[2] and will shortly discover that it underlies the soteriology of Marcion of Sinope.[3] For the Odist, man's lost condition is the lingering consequence of Adam's disobedience and consequent expulsion from the heavenly Paradise to earth.[4] Eschatological salvation, therefore, consists essentially in the restoration of man to Paradise made possible by the Incarnation and Ascension of Christ.

In spite of the many striking parallels between these Jewish traditions and the Odes of Solomon, there is one principle difference whose significance cannot be overemphasized. In Judaism, with the exception of the Qumran community, the eschatological salvation conceptualized as a return to the pristine state was always viewed as wholly futuristic in a strict temporal sense.[5] In the conception of eschatological salvation expressed in the Odes, the temporal boundaries between present and future have been obliterated within the context of charismatic worship, and the glories of the future eschatological state, conceived as a restoration of primal conditions, are experienced as a present reality within the cult.

The Odist frequently expresses the conviction that he has been carried to Paradise:[6] "And he carried me to his Paradise, where is the abundance of the pleasure of the Lord" (Ode 11:16-17). Again, in Ode 20:7, we find the statement :"But put on the grace

der wahre Hintergrund der in den Oden vertretenen Auffassungen ist dagegen in der Welt des Judentums zu finden. Das ist nicht verwunderlich, wenn wir uns daran erinnern, dass das Christentum in Syrien auf die Predigt christlich gewordener Juden zurückgeht." We must, however, disagree with Klijn when he denies that Judaism is the most appropriate background against which to interpret the Fourth Gospel (*supra*, p. 65).

[1] *Supra*, pp. 12f.

[2] *Supra*, pp. 37-42.

[3] *Infra*, pp. 215ff.

[4] *Supra*, pp. 39f., we have briefly outlined the Jewish Adam-traditions and discussed their relevance for the soteriological thoughtforms of the Dead Sea Scrolls. While "Adam" is not specifically mentioned in the Odes of Solomon, nor is the expulsion from Paradise alluded to, the soteriology of the Odes would be impenetrable if the importance of this Paradise motif were not recognized; cf. Abbott, *Light on the Gospel*, p. 379.

[5] Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*, p. 364.

[6] The word "Paradise" is used five times within the Odes: 11:16, 18, 23, 24; 20:7.

of the Lord without stint and come into his Paradise and make yourself a garland from its tree." This heavenly journey is also expressed in a number of other ways. In Ode 38:1, for example, the Odist says, "'I went up to the light of truth as if into a chariot and the truth took me and led me." [1] Again in Ode 36:1-2 we find this statement:

> I rested on the Spirit of the Lord, and the Spirit raised me on high, and made me stand on my feet in the height of the Lord, before his perfection and glory, while I was praising him by the composition of his songs.

This "Himmelfahrt" is particularly well-described in Ode 21 (entire):

> My arms I lifted up to the Most High
> To the grace of the Lord,
> Because he had cast off my bonds from me
> And my helper had lifted me up to his grace and his salvation.
> And I put off darkness
> And clothed myself with light.
> And my soul acquired members
> in which there is no sickness nor affliction nor pain.
> And increasingly helpful was the thought of the Lord to me
> And his fellowship in incorruption.
> And I was lifted up in his light
> And I served before him.
> And I came near to him, praising and confessing him.
> My heart ran over and was found in my mouth,
> And it arose upon my lips.
> And the exaltation of the Lord increased on my face
> And his praise likewise. Hallelujah!

The effects which are attendant on this trip to the celestial Paradise include those blessings which Jewish eschatology expected to accompany the restoration of primal conditions in the future:

[1] The mention of a chariot within a context where a trip to the celestial Paradise is in view calls to mind Gershom Scholem's claim that Paul's use of the term "Paradise" in II Cor. 12:3 together with an experience of mystical transport puts the apostle of the Gentiles in the tradition of Jewish Merkabah ("chariot") mysticism (*Jewish Gnosticism*, pp. 16f.). The antiquity of this variety of Jewish mysticism is attested by the discovery of the so-called Angelic Liturgy (4QS1) at Qumran, revealing that the Essenes of Qumran were occupied with the Throne or Chariot mysticism so characteristic of medieval Jewish mysticism; cf. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, pp. 332-35. Paul's equation of Paradise with the third heaven (II Cor. 12:2-3), was a heritage from Judaism (cf. Apocalupsis Mosis 40:2; II Baruch 59:8; III Baruch 4-9).

(1) freedom from disease and pain (Odes 6:15-18; 18:3; 21:4; 25:8-9),[1] (2) investiture with a celestial garment of immortality or light (Odes 4:6-8; 7:4; 11:11; 15:8; 20:7-8; 21:5; 25:8). (3) possession of immortal or eternal life (Odes 3:8; 5:14-15; 6:18; 21:5; 31:7), (4) possession of a crown or garland (1:1, 4; 5:12; 9:8-11; 17:1; 20:7-9),[2] (5) admission to the presence of the Lord in the company of the redeemed (7:16-25; 36:1-8),[3] and (6) the joyful participation with angels in the praise and worship of God

---

[1] The Jewish Christian conception of Mary's giving birth to Jesus without incurring physical pain (Ascension of Isaiah 11:8-14; Protevangelium of James 19 and 20; Acts of Peter 24; cf. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, pp. 215ff.) is also found in Ode 19:7. In our opinion, this legend was not motivated by docetic Christology so much as by the realization that the birth of the Messiah signalled the return of pristine conditions, when (according to II Baruch 73:7) women will no longer suffer pain as they bear children.

[2] In Jewish literature, the image of the "crown" was associated with the messianic age as well as with the righteous in Paradise. A Marmorstein, "Kranz und Krone in den Oden Salomos," *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, XV (1912), 307-8, gives a number of rabbinic references demonstrating this point and emphasizing the Jewish-Christian orientation of the Odes. On p. 308, he concludes by saying ". . . das die Anschauung vom Leben der Frommen, geschmückt mit einer Krone auf dem Haupte im Paradiese, die wir in späteren christlichen wie jüdischen Quellen so häufig antreffen, auf vorchristliche, jüdische Vorstellungen zurück führen ist." Cf. the eschatological significance of the crown in the Dead Sea Scrolls: 1QS 4:8; 1QH 9:25; 1QSb 4:2f., 28. Crowns were also symbolic of attaining the afterlife in Hellenism; Peregrinus was said to have appeared in white raiment after his death and wearing a garland made of wild olive (Lucian *De morte Peregrini* 40). For a thorough study of the significance of crown-symbolism in antiquity and early Christianity, see Karl Baus, *Der Kranz in Antike und Christentum* (Theophaneia: Beiträge zur Religions- und Kirchengeschichte des Altertums, Bd. 2; Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1940). The association of crowns or garlands with garments in a future-oriented context is found in I Peter 5:4-5; Ascension of Isaiah 9:7-13; 9:24-26; 11:40; Shepherd of Hermas *Sim.* 8. 2. 1-3; *Mand.* 12. 2. 5. The use of the crown as a symbol for victory in early Christian literature is almost always future-oriented (I Cor. 9:25; II Tim. 4:8; James 1:12; Rev. 2:10; 3:11; 4:4, 10; 6:2; 14:14; Martyrdom of Polycarp 17:1; 19:2; II Clement 7:1-3; 20:2; Hermas *Sim.* 8. 3. 6; 8. 4. 6. If the woman of Rev. 12 is interpreted as the Church, it is significant that she already has possession of her crown (Rev. 12:1; cf. Matt. 16:18).

[3] Cf. Ascension of Isaiah 9:27-28: "And I saw one standing whose glory surpassed that of all, and his glory was great and wonderful. And after I had beheld him, all the righteous whom I had seen and all the angels whom I had seen came unto him, and Adam, Abel and Seth and all the righteous approached first, worshipped him and praised him, all with one voice, and I also sang praise with them, and my song of praise was like theirs."

in Paradise.[1] The attainment of Paradise within the context of prophetic inspiration has roots deeply embedded in Jewish apocalyptic.[2] The apocalyptist is carried by the Spirit to the heavenly realm not only to receive foreknowledge of events which will eventually transpire on earth, but also to get a preview of the modes of eschatological existence which the righteous will experience. The decisive difference between Jewish apocalyptic and the Odes is the recurrent use of the perfect verb in the latter to express the proleptic participation of the worshipping community in the benefits of eschatological salvation.

The supreme reality of the heavenly world has so impressed the Odist and the congregation for whom he speaks that in contrast the earthly world appears transitory and phantasmal. He is therefore able to say in Ode 34:1-6:

> No way is hard where there is a simple heart,
> Nor is there any wound where the thoughts are upright.
> There is no storm in the depth of enlightened thought,
> Where one is surrounded by every beautiful place,
> There is nothing that is divided,
> The likeness of what is below.
> He is the one that is above, for everything is above.
> What is below is nothing but the imagination of those without knowledge.
> Grace has been revealed for your salvation.
> Believe and live and be saved! Hallelujah!

The actuality of the experience of eschatological salvation places the Odist beyond the point where persecution or suffering can

[1] Since the Odes are primarily hymns of praise and thanksgiving, eschatological joy as an aspect of realized eschatology is particularly stressed (Odes 11:10, 14-15; 18:1; 26:1; 36:1-2). Cf. Bultmann on the eschatological joy in a cultic context in his article "*Agalliaomai*, etc.," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, I, 20f.

[2] In this respect, it is interesting to note the number of points of contact which the Odes of Solomon have with the Apocalypse of John. Just as John (in a form typical of Jewish apocalyptic) could ask the meaning of that which he was allowed to see, so does our Odist while on a "Himmelfahrt" in Ode 38:10-11: "And I asked the Truth, 'Who are these?' And he said to me, 'This is the deceiver and the error, and they are alike in the beloved and his bride and they lead astray and corrupt the whole world.'" The dragon with seven heads in Ode 22 need not be traced further than Rev. 13:1-3; cf. R. H. Connolly, "The Odes of Solomon: Jewish or Christian?" *Journal of Theological Studies*, XIII (1911-12), 300. Ode 9:11 ("And all those who have conquered shall be written in this book") recalls Rev. 3:5, and the "new song" (song of the new age) mentioned in Ode 31:3 and 41:16 recalls Rev. 5:9 and 14:3.

have any significant effect on him (Odes 5:4-6; 28:4-7), for he lives in the presence of the Lord (Ode 5:14-15: "If all things visible should perish, I shall not die, because the Lord is with me and I am with him.").

The concept of eschatological "rest" is closely connected with the Paradise motif, yet its importance in the Odes demands separate treatment.[1] Whatever its later history in Gnostic soteriology, this concept certainly originated and was initially developed within Judaism.[2] IV Ezra 8:51-52, like a number of other Jewish sources,[3] connects "rest" with Paradise in an eschatological context:

> But think of your own case,
> And inquire concerning the glory of those like yourself,
> Because it is for you that Paradise is opened,
> The tree of life is planted,

---

[1] Cf. Philipp Vielhauer, "*Anapausis*: zum gnostischen Hintergrund des Thomasevangeliums," *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1965), pp. 215-34. In this article Vielhauer tends to overemphasize the Gnostic character of *anapausis*-speculation in early Christianity.

[2] Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*, p. 384; Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, III, 687: "'The day of the Sabbath' Ps 92, 1, that is the day, which is a complete Sabbath (rest), on which there is no eating or drinking, no buying or selling, but the righteous will be seated with crowns on their heads, refreshing themselves by the brilliance of the Shekinah." In Ernst Käsemann's discussion of the historical development of *anapausis*-speculation, he holds that it was originally Jewish, and reached a high point of development within Alexandrian Judaism where it was incorporated into Gnostic thought; cf. *Das wandernde Gottesvolk: Eine Untersuchung zum Hebräerbrief* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Heft 55; 2. Aufl.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), p. 44.

[3] Cf. II Baruch 73:1: "And it shall come to pass, when He has brought everything low that is in the world, and has sat down in peace for the age on the throne of His kingdom, that joy shall then be revealed, and rest shall appear." II Enoch 8:1-3 locates Paradise in the third heaven, and states that it is the place where God himself rests (cf. Apocalupsis Mosis 37:4; 41:1). Since II Enoch 9:1 calls Paradise the eternal inheritance of the righteous, we find that the spiritualization of the Abrahamic promise (i.e., the transfer of the fulfilment of the promises from the earthly to the heavenly realm) forms the presupposition for the views on the "promises," the "inheritance," and the "rest" found in Hebrews; cf. Käsemann, *Das wandernde Gottesvolk*, p. 41: "Es sollte eigentlich klar sein dass sie [Ruhe] ein himmlisches Gut ist und also den Besitz Kanaans nicht einschliesst." In IV Ezra 7:80, 91, 95, the eternal state of the righteous is described in terms of a "rest" in seven orders (cf. IV Ezra 7:123). Similarly in Vita Adae et Evae 36:1-2, Adam asks Eve and Seth to go to the outskirts of Paradise and by repentance to try to obtain a drop of the oil of life that he may find rest from his pain. They find that the oil of life will only again become available in the eschaton (cf. Apocalupsis Mosis 9:3).

The Age to Come is prepared,
Plenty is provided,
A city is built,
Rest is appointed,
Goodness is established
And wisdom perfected beforehand.

In Christian literature, the concept "rest" first appears as an eschatological category of salvation in two New Testament documents with a strongly Jewish Christian orientation, Matthew and Hebrews. While Matthew 11:28-30 may not be an authentic logion of Jesus,[1] it does reflect the eschatological interest of the Syrian or Palestian community in which that Gospel originated.[2] The "rest" spoken of here is a present reality which may be appropriated by those who become disciples of Jesus. In Hebrews, the eschatological "rest" of the people of God is not only viewed as a future eschatological goal, but also as a present reality which can be experienced by faith.[3] This is made clear by the use of the present tense in Hebrews 4:3, 10; the emphasis on faith is found in 3:19 and 4:3.[4]

In the Odes of Solomon, the attainment of eschatological "rest" is regarded as an eschatological reality fully realized in present experience.[5] Participation in this eschatological state is mediated by the Spirit of God (Ode 26:10), and is such a necessary presupposition for charismatic speech that the Odist refers to his compositions as "odes of His rest" (Ode 26:3). Frequently the idea of quietness and calm is coupled with that of "rest" (Odes 32:3; 34:2; 35:1, 4; 36:8).[6] The Odist also speaks of this "rest" as

[1] Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, p. 160: "Matt. 11. 28-30 is a quotation from Jewish Wisdom literature put into the mouth of Jesus." In the light of our study of the Odes of Solomon, it is more likely that such a logion arose as a "Prophetenspruch" within the charismatic worship of an early Jewish Christian congregation. Cf. *supra*, p. 176, n. 3.

[2] The recent attempt by S. G. F. Brandon to refute the Syrian or Palestinian origin of Matthew in favor of Alexandria must be rejected as entirely unsuccessful (*Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity* [Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967], pp. 286-315).

[3] C. K. Barrett, "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954), 366-73.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 372.

[5] Cf. Vielhauer, "*Anapausis*," p. 226: "Besonders eindrucksvoll sprechen die Oden Salomos von der Gegenwärtigkeit der Ruhe; deren Zukünftigkeit tritt fast ganz zurück."

[6] Silence and stillness are also important to Ignatius (cf. Eph. 6:1; 15:1-2;

attainable through knowledge (Ode 26:12), and capable of appropriation through faith (Ode 28:3; cf. Heb. 4:3). The Odist prays earnestly for this experience (Ode 37:1-4; cf. Shepherd of Hermas *Mand.* 11. 9), which becomes the basis for the charismatic praise of God (Ode 26:12: "It is sufficient to know and to rest, for in rest the singers stand, like a river which has an abundant fountain, and flows to the help of them that seek it."). As an integral part of the Paradise motif, eschatological "rest" is closely linked to the cultic experience of journeying to Paradise (Odes 11:11-17; 20:7-9; 35:5-7; 36:1; 38:1-4).

We have already stressed the principal difference between the use of the Paradise motif as a major mode of conceptualizing eschatological salvation in Judaism on the one hand and the Odes of Solomon on the other. In Jewish eschatology (with the notable exception of Qumran), the realization of primal conditions (protology) lay in the future, while in the community in which the Odes of Solomon arose, participation in future eschatological salvation is proleptically actualized within the context of Christian worship. This difference is grounded on the essential distinction between Judaism and Christianity. For Judaism, eschatological conditions can only be inaugurated by a future act of God. For Christianity, the eschaton has already been initiated by a decisive past act of God in Christ.[1] The Incarnation is the focal point of the soteriology of the Odes, and it is that event alone which makes the present realization of eschatological salvation possible.

Ode 7:4-6 expresses the thought that it is the consubstantiality of the Redeemer with the nature of man which made redemption possible:[2]

> He became like me that I might receive him,
> He was reckoned like myself in order that I might put him on.
> I did not tremble when I saw him,
> Because he is my salvation.
> Like my nature he became that I might learn him,
> And like my form, that I might not turn back from him.

19:1; Philad. 1:1). In Magn. 8:2 he describes Jesus as the word of God proceeding from silence. While this reference certainly refers to the Incarnation, it also has current significance for Ignatius in that it probably refers to the way in which Jesus manifests himself in the cultic worship of the church by means of the prophetic word.

[1] *Supra*, p. 6.

[2] Rudolph, "War der Verfasser der Oden Salomos ein 'Qumran-Christ?'" p. 526; Adam, *Die Zeit der alten Kirche*, p. 144.

The Messiah has blazed the redemptive trail which all his adherents must follow (Odes 11:3; 22:7; 24:10; cf. 27; 33:13; 38:4-8; 39; 42:12-20). The goal of eschatological salvation is not only restoration to Paradise, but also what Vielhauer has appropriately called a "Liebesvereinigung" with the Redeemer.[1] This is clearly stated in Ode 3:7-9:

> I have been united to him, because I shall find love to the Beloved
> And because I shall love him that is the son that I may be a son.
> For he that is joined to him who is immortal,
> Will himself become immortal.
> And he who is accepted in the Living One
> Will become living.

This soteriological union with Christ is also described in Ode 8:22-23:

> Ask and abound and abide in the love of the Lord,
> And the beloved ones in the Beloved,
> And those who are kept in him who lives,
> And those who are redeemed in him who was redeemed.
> And you shall be found incorrupt in all ages,
> to the name of your Father. Hallelujah!

That this experience of "Liebesvereinigung" is also an aspect of eschatological salvation experienced in the present is demonstrated by the correlation of the concepts "rest" and "union" in Ode 3:4-9.

While eternal life as a soteriological category occupies a significant position in the theology of both the Gospel of John and the Odes of Solomon, the total context in which this concept is found is quite different in the two documents. In the Odes, eternal or immortal life is one aspect of the Paradise motif which dominates the conception of eschatological salvation in them. In the Fourth Gospel, eternal life is itself the central way in which final salvation is conceptualized. Just as dwelling in Paradise is equivalent to eternal life in II Enoch 65:8-10, and everlasting life and the glory of Adam are parallel in Damascus Document 3:19-21, so in the Odes (15:10-11), "deathless life" is a corollary of living in Paradise. Immortality is a consequence of partaking in eschatological life in the presence of the Lord, according to Ode 5:10-15:

---

[1] Vielhauer, "*Anapausis*," p. 226.

For my hope is upon the Lord,
And I will not be afraid.
And because the Lord is my salvation,
I will not fear.
He is a garland on my head and I shall not be moved.
Even if everything should be shaken,
I stand firm
And if everything visible should perish,
I shall not die,
Because the Lord is with me and I with him. Hallelujah!

In keeping with this emphasis, the Odist regards the world of man apart from the Messiah as belonging to the realm of death (Odes 22:8; 29:4; 42:14). Belief in the Redeemer is that which produces life (Odes 22:7-8; 34:6; 41:3-4). The Christocentricity of the soteriology of the Odes is succintly expressed in Ode 15:6-9:

The way of error have I forsaken,
And have walked toward him and have received salvation from him without grudging.
And according to his bounty he has given to me,
And according to his excellent beauty he has made me.
I have put on incorruption through his name,
And have put off corruption by his grace.
Death has been destroyed before my face,
And Sheol has been abolished by my word.

Conclusions

The Odes of Solomon are of crucial importance for the history of early Christian theology because of the strong emphasis which they place on realized eschatology. The precise meaning of this phenomenon, however, is dependent on whether or not the original historical and cultic setting of the Odes can be determined. The Odes appear to be prophetic or charismatic hymns of praise and thanksgiving which were of central importance in the worship services of early Christian communities in Syria. Participation in eschatological salvation through the proleptic experience of partaking in the heavenly worship of God within the framework of an earthly church service was mediated to the cult leader and his congregation by the Spirit of God. There is no way of precisely determining the meaning which the "sacraments" had to the Odist; it can perhaps be assumed that they were an integral part of and therefore the presupposition for participation in charismatic worship.

The Jewish Christian character of the Odes of Solomon has been clearly established by our investigation of the ways in which eschatological salvation is conceptualized in them. Drawing primarily from what we have called the Paradise motif, the Odes presuppose that man's lost condition was the result of Adam's disobedience and consequent expulsion from the heavenly Paradise to earth. Salvation was therefore conceived as the restoration of man to the Paradise from which he had fallen together with a reinstatement of the primal blessings which Adam had originally enjoyed. Participation in this eschatological salvation had been made possible by the Incarnation and Ascension of the Messiah. Therefore, while the modes of eschatological existence were looked upon as belonging to the future age in Judaism, in the Odes of Solomon the temporary boundary between present and future has been obliterated within the context of charismatic worship, where the glories of the future eschatological salvation are experienced and actualized in present cultic experience.

CHAPTER VI

THE PRESENT REALIZATION OF ESCHATOLOGICAL SALVATION IN THE THOUGHT OF MARCION OF SINOPE

Introduction

In view of the importance of Syrian Christianity for the substructure of Marcion's thought, together with the more apparent influences of Paul and Gnosticism, it would be very appropriate to ask how (if at all) Marcion related the present and future aspect of eschatological salvation.[1] A satisfactory solution to this question can be formulated only after three significant questions have been answered: (1) what is the essential nature of salvation in the thought of Marcion? (2) how did he conceptualize future eschatological existence? (3) to what degree (if any) could aspects of this future eschatological existence be appropriated and experienced in the present time? Each of these questions will be considered at length in the first three sections of the present chapter. The final section will deal with the question of ascetic motivations common to Syrian Christianity and Marcion.

The very formulation of these three questions presupposes the hypothesis which forms the basis for the present discussion. Briefly stated, it is that Marcion's ascetic baptismal requirements reveal that for him the rite was the effective means for actualizing and inaugurating an individually and ontologically realized form of eschatological salvation which demanded present conformity to what he conceived to be the future mode of eschatological existence.[2]

---

[1] On Marcion's relationship to Syrian Christianity, cf. *infra*, pp. 215ff. In the early catholic church, Paul could appropriately (but not disparagingly) be called the *apostolus haereticorum* because of the abundant use which "heretics" made of the Pauline corpus (Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 3. 5; *idem De praescr. haer.* 23. 1-3; Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 3. 13. 1 [Harvey, II, 72]). On Marcion's relationship to Gnosticism, cf. *infra*, p. 198, n. 2.

[2] At this point it must be admitted that it is often difficult (if not impossible) to distinguish the original teachings of Marcion from the later elaborations of Marcionites. One of the criteria which will be used within this study to distinguish the emphases of Marcion himself with regard to asceticism will be the presence of eschatological motives. If the eschatological motivation for Marcionite asceticism can be established, its antiquity is

To claim that asceticism was a vehicle for the present realization of eschatological salvation is to give Marcion's ascetic motivation a predominantly positive rather than negative intention.[1] This positively motivated asceticism is closely related to the eschatologically determined asceticism of Paul, which was primarily grounded on the imminence of the Parousia. It is our contention as well that Marcionite asceticism is not only phenomenologically similar to the Christian asceticism of Syria, but that in fact the two are genetically

assured. If Marcion's asceticism can be traced back (through Cerdo) to an origin in Syrian Christianity, it certainly cannot have been an element added by later (non-Syrian) Marcionites.

[1] In Harnack's monograph on Marcion, the great Berlin scholar repeatedly attributes Marcion's asceticism to an entirely negative motive. Harnack not only described Marcion's asceticism as a protest against the flesh and against material nature (based on the Greek assumption of the metaphysical dualism of flesh and spirit), but also as a protest against the God of the world and law (*Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott, eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche* [2. Aufl.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1960], p. 149). Cf. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, I, 273-74: "But the strict asceticism which Marcion demanded as a Christian, could have had no motive without the Greek assumption of a metaphysical contrast of flesh and spirit, which in fact was also apparently the doctrine of Paul." Harnack's judgment in this instance is no more justified in the case of Marcion than it is in the case of Paul. Although even an abbreviated summary of early Christian ascetic motivations is beyond the scope of the present study (see H. Chadwick, "Enkrateia," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, V, 243-65), a brief enumeration of the positive motives for asceticism would not be out of place: (1) In obvious dependence upon Paul, Tertullian reiterates the eschatological motivation for asceticism in *De monogamia* 7. 4: "At ubi et 'Crescite et redundate' euacuauit extremitas temporum, inducente apostolo: 'Superest ut et qui habent uxores sic sint ac si non habeant,' qui tempus in collectum est." Cf. *idem De pudicitia* 16. 19. Otto Betz observes that the Qumran community also had an eschatologically motivated asceticism ("The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai-Tradition," pp. 93f.). (2) Elsewhere Tertullian expresses the Hellenistic idea that ascetic practises are an anticipation of divinization: "Si enim deus aeternus non esuriet, ut testatur per Esaiam, hoc erit tempus, quo homo deo adaequetur, cum sine pabulo uiuit" (*De ieiunio* 6. 7). (3) In addition, the eschatological motivation to accelerate the coming of the kingdom of God by asceticism is stressed by both Erik Peterson and Arthur Vööbus (cf. *infra* p. 197, n. 1), a motive which they see as particularly characteristic of Syrian Christianity. (4) Finally, imitation of the ascetic earthly life of Jesus can also be a positive motivation for the practise of asceticism: "In primis de suo exemplo, tunc de ceteris argumentis, cum puerorum dicit esse regnum caelorum, cum consortes illis facit alios post nuptias pueros" (Tertullian *De monogamia* 8. 7). Georg Kretschmar sees this motive as being of particular significance in the origin of Christian asceticism in his article "Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Ursprung frühchristlicher Askese," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, LXI (1964), 27-67.

related.[1] The negative motivation for asceticism, based as it is on a contempt for the flesh and for material nature generally, was of course the other side of the coin (cf. Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 4. 12, referring to Marcion's fasting on the Sabbath). The gradual overemphasis on the negative aspects of asceticism was the result of a changing historical situation in which the followers of Marcion lost sight of their founder's original eschatological orientation.

The Nature of Salvation According to Marcion

The point of departure for Marcion's soteriology was the distinction between the cruelly just creator God of the Old Testament and the God of grace and love revealed for the first time and in a totally unexpected manner through Jesus Christ.[2] Unlike other second century Gnostics with whom he is usually (though provisionally) associated, Marcion held that since man was created by the God of this world he bore no affinity whatsoever to the God of

[1] Erik Peterson finds an eschatological basis for asceticism in the apocryphal acts of the apostles which consists in a desire to accelerate the coming of the kingdom of God in an article entitled "Einige Beobachtungen zu den Anfängen der christlichen Askese," *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Rome, Freiburg and Vienna: Herder, 1959), p. 218. Arthur Vööbus has attributed a similar motivation to Christian ascetics in the early Syrian church in his book, *Celibacy, a Requirement for Admission to Baptism* (Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile, No. 1; Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 1951), p. 33. The same thought is expressed in his larger work, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Vol. CLXXIV; Louvain: Van den Bempt, 1958), I, 89f. While Syrian asceticism was in fact eschatologically motivated, that motivation was not (it seems to me) inspired by a desire to accelerate the coming of the kingdom of God. Although Vööbus mentions this motivation several times in the above-mentioned works, no documentation is ever offered in substantiation of this point. Gilles Quispel traces the Gospel of Thomas back to an origin in ascetic Syrian Christianity and makes the following comparison between the doctrinal similarities between the Syrian father Makarios and the author of the Gospel of Thomas: "For both . . . Christ is our Father, and the Holy Spirit our Mother: man should be one, because God is one. Man originates in the heavenly Paradise, and has fallen because he has tasted the bitterness of desire and has drunk the venom with which the serpent infected the fruit of knowledge. But now eschatology has been realized, the resurrection is already here, owing to Christ. Therefore, man should dissolve his marriage, leave his wife and children, follow Christ and identify himself with Him, in order to gain the Paradise here and now" ("Gnosticism and the New Testament," *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. J. Philip Hyatt [New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965], p. 257).

[2] Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 4. 6. 3: "Inter hos magnam et omnem differentiam scindit, quantam inter iustum et bonum, quantam inter legem et euangelium, quantam inter Iudaismum et Christianismum."

love.[1] For Marcion, therefore, salvation could not consist in the self-realization of one's divine origin (as in Gnosticism),[2] but rather in the appropriation of redemption as the free gift of a merciful and loving God. Within the framework of this metaphysical dualism, Marcion thought of salvation as consisting essentially in the redemption of man from the dominion of the creator God and from creation itself as purchased by Christ's death.[3] One of the consequences of this concept of redemption was that there

---

[1] It is important to emphasize the fact that Marcion apparently thought that the good God had no part in the creation of man's body, soul or spirit (Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 105f.), and that there was therefore no natural bond of relatedness between the God of love and mankind (*ibid.*, p. 118). In discussing the origin of man according to orthodox doctrine, Tertullian makes the following statement in *Adv. Marc.* 2. 4. 4: "bonitas inflauit in animam, non mortuam, sed uiuam." Interpreting this statement on the basis of its anti-Marcionite context, it would be proper to conclude that Marcion believed that a *dead soul* had been breathed into the first man by the creator God. This will have its further ramifications later in our discussion. Later Marcionites approximated the true Gnostic position by asserting that in addition to the body and the animal soul which were both destined to perish, another spirit was ascribed to man as the original gift of the God of love (Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 165).

[2] Although Harnack refused to classify Marcion as a Gnostic, most modern scholars would disagree with him on this point. The crucial issue is the problem of giving Gnosticism a basic definition. If the basis of this syncretistic religious movement is thought to be the tragic split in the deity, then Marcion must be regarded as a Gnostic. If the basis of Gnosticism is thought to be self-salvation through right knowledge, then Marcion should not be regarded as a Gnostic. A mediating position is espoused by R. McL. Wilson, *Gnosis and the New Testament*, p. 22: "Similarly Marcion shows certain affinities with Gnosticism, but it is open to question whether he should be classified simply as a Gnostic, without qualification." After carefully distinguishing between Gnosis and Gnosticism (*supra*, p. 26, n. 2), Wilson relates Marcion to the former rather than the latter category (*ibid.*, pp. 23, 63). An examination of Harnack's parallels between Marcion and Gnosticism is instructive at this point (*Marcion*, pp. 196ff.). Two recent attempts have been made to demonstrate Marcion's proximity to Gnosticism by emphasizing his use of the word "knowledge." P. G. Verweijs, *Evangelium und neues Gesetz in der ältesten Christenheit bis auf Marcion* (Studia Theologica Rheno-Traiectina, Vol. V; Utrecht: H. Kemink en Zoon, 1960), pp. 263f., disputes Harnack's generalization that Gnostic religion is distinguished by gnosis while for Marcion religion is determined by faith, calling this judgment "onesided." Similarly, Ugo Bianchi, "Marcion: Théologien Biblique ou Docteur Gnostique?" *Vigiliae Christianae*, XXI (1967), 141-49, examines the occurrences of the term "knowledge" in Marcion and concludes that this inextricably links Marcion with Gnosticism. It has yet to be demonstrated (in my opinion) that by "knowledge" Marcion means the self-realization of one's divine origin.

[3] Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 137.

was no place nor need for the kind of physical resurrection of the body espoused by most of his contemporaries. This aspect of Marcionite theology was particularly repugnant to such heresiologists as Irenaeus and Tertullian.[1]

The primary objective of redemption in the soteriology of Marcion, therefore, was the liberation of man from the *regnum creatoris*.[2] Other consequences of redemption, such as the forgiveness of sins, were only secondary and received far less emphasis.[3] If it is assumed that complete deliverance from creation, flesh and matter could only be achieved in the future, salvation then takes on a decidedly futuristic emphasis in the thought of Marcion.[4] Within the framework of this present world, salvation could then be conceived as taking the form of an inner transformation which releases man's essential nature from the dominion of the creator God and places him within the sphere of the dominion of the God of love.[5] In line with these assumptions, Harnack contended that

---

[1] Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 1. 25. 2 (Harvey, I, 218): "Salutem autem solum animarum esse futuram, earum quae ejus doctrinam didicissent; corpus autem, videlicet quoniam a terra sit sumptum, impossibile esse participare salutem." Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 1. 24. 3: "Sed nolo iam de parte maiore pereuntium imperfectae bonitatis arguere deum Marcionis: sufficit ipsos, quos saluos facit, imperfectae salutis inuentos imperfectam bonitatem eius ostendere, scilicet anima tenus saluos, carne deperditos, quae apud illum non resurgit."

[2] Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 132; Eugène de Faye, *Gnostiques et Gnosticisme* (2nd ed.; Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1925), pp. 162ff.; Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 1. 24. 6: "Erat et illud perfectae bonitatis, ut homo, liberatus in fidem die optimi, statim eximeretur de domicilio atque dominatu dei saeui." See also Epiphanius *Panarion* 42. 8. 1-2.

[3] Verweijs, *Evangelium und neues Gesetz*, p. 262.

[4] This assumption is expressed by Lietzmann, *The Beginnings of the Christian Church*, p. 260: "Redemption won in this way worked itself out only in the future for it concerned only the soul; as long as a man was still in the flesh, he belonged bodily to this world and its Lord, and must bear its oppression and persecution: true Christians had also to bear the same distress and the same hatred." The same future orientation in Marcion soteriology is repeatedly stressed by Harnack. For example: "Zwar hat er ihm die Menschen abgekauft, aber das ist ein, wenn auch absolute sicherer, Wechsel auf die Zukunft, weil so lange dieses Säkulum besteht, auch noch die Herrschaft des deus huius seculi dauert" (*Marcion*, p. 137; cf. p. 96).

[5] This position is succinctly summarized by Ernst Ulrich Schüle, "Der Ursprung des Bösen bei Marcion," *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*, XVI (1964), 25f.: "Seine Wirklichkeit ist eindeutig geworden, und der erlöste Mensch ist aus der Verhaftung an die Welt ihren Schöpfer zur reinen, vollkommenen Innerlichkeit geführt worden, die für ihn eine Art geistige Wiedergeburt bedeutet. Es ist dies also nicht eine Erneurung des alten Menschen im Sinne der lutherischen renovatio totius hominis,

faith was the means whereby Marcion taught that salvation could be appropriated with a resultant inner transformation of the believing Marcionite.[1] The total futurity of Marcionite soteriology emphasized by both Lietzmann and Harnack is open to serious question.

Verweijs has, in our opinion, successfully refuted the contention of Harnack that this inner transformation was effected by faith, but he fails to offer an alternative solution by which the nature of the envisioned transformation is defined, and the way in which it is effected in the believer delineated.[2] A significant deficiency in Harnack's discussion of Marcionite soteriology becomes clear when it is realized that sacramentalism plays no role whatsoever in the discussion, but is only later treated in a section on church cultus, organization and ethics.[3] It is quite apparent that the presuppositions, order and organization of traditional Protestant dogmatics have destroyed the vital connection which existed in Marcionite soteriology between redemption and its appropriation through participation in the sacraments. The blame is compounded in light of the well-known fact that the sacramentalism of the Marcionite church and that of early Catholicism was largely identical in both theory and practise.[4] Therefore,

sonder gerade eine Abkehr von allem Körperlich-Materiellen und damit von Sünde, Tod, Schuld und Fleisch zu einem neuen Sein im Geiste des neuen Gottes."

[1] Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 96, 137. On p. 134, Harnack makes a grave oversimplification: "Weil man das ewige Leben allein der Liebe Gottes verdankt, so ist die einzige, aber auch notwendige Bedingung hier der Glaube."

[2] Verweijs' objection is based on the fact that although Harnack adduces a passage in Adamantius *Dial.* 2. 6 as proof that the inner transformation was effected by faith, the critical note in the edition of Adamantius by Bakhuyzen makes that reading doubtful (*Evangelium und neues Gesetz*, p. 266). The so-called "inner renewal" spoken of in that passage, therefore, cannot be linked definitely with faith. Verweijs also expresses his inability to discover the formal principle of the Marcionite "inner transformation"; "Leider fehlen aber bei den Kirchenvätern alle Angaben darüber, wie sich Marcion das Zustandekommen dieser Umkehr vorstellte" (*ibid.*, pp. 266f.).

[3] Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 143-52.

[4] Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 145: "Hiernach können sich die Marcionitischen Gottesdienste und h. Handlungen nicht wesentlich von denen der grossen Kirche unterschieden haben." This point is also confirmed by E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence* (London: S. P. C. K. 1948), p. 7. The similarity between Marcionite and Catholic baptism at the beginning of the third century is revealed both by the fact that Marcionites did not rebaptize those who came to them from the Great Church (Cyprian *Epistles* 73. 4), as well as by the fact that influential men in the Great Church felt

Harnack's polarization of faith and sacrament as the effective means for appropriating and actualizing the benefits of redemption within Marcion's soteriology would appear to be not only artificial but totally unwarranted.[1]

Harnack insists on reading Marcion in terms of the Hellenistic dualism of flesh and spirit, as this statement reveals:

> *Metabolē* kenne ich (aus der vorkatholischen Literatur) aus Justin, Apol. I. 66; dort heisst es, dass durch die h. Speise im Abendmahl unser Fleisch und Blut *kata metabolēn* ernährt werden. Eine mystisch-sakramentale Veränderung unserer leiblichen Nature ist gemeint. M. dagegen denkt an eine innere Umwandlung durch den Glauben. Paulus spricht von der neuen Kreatur. M. hat ihn verstanden.[2]

If we grant Harnack's view that Marcionite asceticism was motivated by thoroughly negative considerations, then we will not find it difficult to limit the "transformation" of the Marcionite believer to his "inner" or "spiritual" component. However, once a primarily positive motive is found for Marcion's ascetic emphases, the very polarization of flesh and spirit in Marcionite theology becomes problematic. Here we must say with Verweijs that "wir müssen vielmehr voraussetzen, dass Marcion in viel stärkerem Masse physisch gedacht hat, als man gemeinhin annimmt." [3] This question will be discussed in greater detail when we treat the question of whether or not aspects of the Marcionite conception of future eschatological existence could be appropriated in this present life.[4]

In conclusion, it can be said that Marcion's soteriology had an essentially future eschatological nature in that redemption could only be completely realized after death. During this present life, however, a believer could experience a "transformation" which

---

that Marcionites who were admitted into the Great Church need not be rebaptized (Cyprian *Epistles* 72. 4). Tertullian's polemic against the validity of heretical baptism demonstrates that there were those who regarded heretical baptism as perfectly valid (*De bapt.* 15).

[1] Certainly the Christian's possession of the Holy Spirit through baptism was not regarded as being unconnected with the faith response of the believer; cf. G. Nathanael Bonwetsch, *Die Theologie des Irenäus* (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, Bd 9; Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1925), pp. 128f. Tertullian *De anima* 1. 4: "Cui Spiritus sanctus accomodatus sine fidei sacramento?"

[2] Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 135, n. 1.

[3] Verweijs, *Evangelium und neues Gesetz*, p. 266.

[4] *Infra*, pp. 211f.

was appropriated by the application of faith to the experience of participation in the sacraments of the Marcionite Church. We can provisionally say that the contrasts between present appropriation and future fulfilment produced a considerable degree of tension in Marcionite soteriology.

Marcion's Conception of Future Eschatological Existence

At the outset it should be noted that Marcion separated himself from all materialistic conceptions of apocalyptic eschatology which Christianity had derived from Judaism in either a mature or else germinal form.[1] Therefore, in order to ascertain precisely what conceptions of future eschatological existence were retained, modified or introduced by Marcion, it will be necessary to investigate those relevant passages of Scripture which he considered authoritative, together with such remnants of his writings as can be reconstructed.[2] Both Marcion's reputation as a "Biblical theologian" and his insistence on literal interpretation are important factors to be kept in mind during this investigation.[3] For a number of reasons (these will be elaborated in the ensuing discussion), the Marcionite version of Luke 20:34-36 is a *crux interpretum* in Marcion's soteriological thought. We shall therefore use this passage as a catalyst for illuminating the meaning of other apparently enigmatical statements made by Marcion (or Marcionites) or Biblical passages which Marcion retained in his Gospel and Apostle.

First of all, a comparison of Luke 20:34-36 with the relevant synoptic parallels (Mark 12:24-25 and Matthew 22:29-30), the Marcionite revision of the Lukan passage and representative patristic quotations of the Lukan passage (see Table 1, 204-5).

The Lukan redaction of Mark 12:24-25 reveals either that Luke found it necessary to radically rewrite his Markan source, or that

---

[1] One very interesting feature of Marcion's thought is that he did not deny the truth of Old Testament history or of Jewish apocalyptic expectation; he simply relegated both to the sphere of the inferior God. According to Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 4. 6.3: "Constituit Marcion alium esse Christum, qui Tiberianis temporibus a deo quondam ignoto reuelatus sit in salutem omnium gentium, alius, qui a deo creatore in restitutionem Iudaici status sit destinatus, quandoque uenturus."

[2] The reconstructed Gospel, Apostle and Antitheses of Marcion made by Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 40*-313*, will be used.

[3] Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 93.

he had another version of the same pericope before him.[1] The latter hypothesis is to be preferred, since the parallelism in the Lukan passage probably belonged to his exemplar since Luke tends to strike out parallelisms in his sources.[2] Both Mark and Matthew (who follows Mark quite closely) are quite clear in stating that those who have been raised from the dead in the eschaton are similar to angels in that sexual intercourse and marriage are no longer possible. The source which Luke used, together with his own editorial modifications, have obscured the clarity of the Markan passage. The resultant ambiguity is susceptible to one of two possible interpretations: (1) The phrase in Luke 20:35a, "those who are accounted worthy to receive that age/world," may mean that the act of being accounted worthy belongs to the future time when the resurrection has occurred and the world to come has been attained; this is the obvious meaning of the Markan and Matthean parallels,[3] and it is also the way in which the great majority of commentators understand the Lukan passage. (2) Literally, the phrase "those who are accounted worthy to obtain that age/world and the resurrection from among the dead" may be construed to mean that the act of being accounted worthy

---

[1] I. H. Marshall notes a tendency in Luke to use a source other than Mark where that source parallels Mark ("Tradition and Theology in Luke [Luke 8:5-15]," *Tyndale Bulletin*, XX [1969], pp. 61f.).

[2] This characteristic of Lukan writing has been noted by Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p. 161. Jeremias cites as an authority, Eduard Norden, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1923), pp. 357-60. On other grounds, T. W. Manson conjectures that Luke 20:34-36 is independent of Mark 12:24-25 in *The Teaching of Jesus: Studies in Its Form and Content* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935), p. 276, n. 3, as does Vincent Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1926), p. 100.

[3] While no Greek manuscript of Luke or Lukan lectionary text contains a future form of εἰμί in Luke 20:36a ("they *are* like angels"), the inherent ambiguity of the Lukan text was removed at a very early date by substituting a future form of εἰμι in patristic quotations of that text. For example, Justin *Dialogue* 81. 4 (see Table 1, p. 205), and Ps.-Justin *De resurrectione* 3, change the phrase ἰσάγγελοι γάρ εἰσιν to ἀλλ' ἰσάγγελοι ἔσονται. Tertullian makes the same interpretive alteration in *Adv. Marc.* 3. 9. 4: "*erunt* enim, inquit, sicut angeli"; 5. 10. 4: "*erimus* enim sicut angeli." Cf. Tertullian *De resurrectione* 36. 5; *Adv. Marc.* 4. 39. 11; Hippolytus *Fragmenta* (Bonwetsch-Achelis, I, 254). These Fathers were interested in underlining the fact that the angelic life was a completely futuristic element of individual eschatology, and their insistence on this fact implies the "heretical" counterposition.

TABLE I

Mark 12:24-25	Matthew 22:29-30	Luke 20:34-36
ἔφη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς	ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς	καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδοτες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ	πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ την δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ	
		οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται
		οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν
ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν	ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει	καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν
οὔτε γαμοῦσιν	οὔτε γαμοῦσιν	οὔτε γαμοῦσιν
οὔτε γαμίζονται	οὔτε γαμίζονται	οὔτε γαμίζονται
		οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται
ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τῳ οὐρανῳ	ἀλλ' ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς εἰσίν	ἰσάγγελοι γάρ εἰσιν
		καὶ υἱοί εἰσιν Θεοῦ
		τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες

(expressed by the aorist substantival participle καταξιωθέντες) occurs *in this life*, thereby creating two classes of men: the sons of *this* age/world (who marry), and the sons of *that* age/world (who do not marry). If the act of being accounted worthy is equated with baptism, then the one baptized must pursue the celibate life since he now belongs to the age to come and is a "son of the resurrection" (Luke 20:36).[1]

In support of this rather bizarre interpretation of Luke 20:24-36, it should be noted that the phrase "the sons of this age/world" is found only in Luke 20:34 and 16:8 in the New Testament. In the latter passage the expression is parallel with the phrase "sons

[1] In Eusebius' description of the teachings of Menander (supposedly the pupil of Simon Magus, and probably the contemporary of the Third Evangelist), in *Hist. eccl.* 3. 26, baptism is explicitly the act which accounts the recipient worthy of instant immortality (διὰ τοῦ μεταδιδομένου πρὸς αὐτοῦ βαπτίσματος οὗ τοὺς καταξιουμένους ἀθανασίαν ἀΐδιον ἐν αὐτῷ τούτῳ μεθέξειν τῷ βίῳ μηκέτι θνήσκοντας). The striking parallels with Luke 20:34-36 may indicate that both Menander and Luke were drawing on a source which was already a gnosticized version of this logion.

PARALLEL TEXTS

Marcion [a]	Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 4. 38. 5	Justin *Dialogus* 81. 4
ἀποκριθείς		
οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου	huius quidem aeui filios	
γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται	nubere	
οὓς δὲ κατηξίωσεν ὁ θεὸς	quos uero dignatus sit deus	
τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν	illius aeui possessione	
[καὶ?] τῆς ἀναστάσεως	et resurrectione	
τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν	a mortuis	
οὔτε γαμοῦσιν	neque nubere	οὔτε γαμήσουσιν
οὔτε γαμίζονται	neque nubi	οὔτε γαμηθήσονται
οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν	quia nec morituri	
ἔτι μέλλουσιν	iam sint	
ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἰσιν	cum similes angelorum	ἀλλὰ ἰσάγγελοι ἔσονται
<καὶ υἱοί εἰσιν> τοῦ Θεοῦ	< > sint dei	
τῆς ἀναστάσεως	resurrectionis	τῆς ἀναστάσεως
υἱοὶ (γεγονότες)	filii facti	< > ὄντες

[a] Greek text reconstructed by Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 229*, from Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 4. 38. 5.

of light," making it clear that Luke saw mankind divided into two spheres of allegiance *in the present time*. The phrase "marrying and giving in marriage" is found in Q (Luke 17:27; Matthew 24:37-39), where it has a definite eschatological coloring. "Marrying and giving in marriage" will characterize those who are not ready for the Parousia, while (presumably) it will not characterize those who are ready for that impending event. On the basis of these considerations, and fully conscious of the fact that we find no support for this position among the many commentators on the Third Gospel, we conclude that in Luke 20:34-36, the Evangelist views abstinence from marriage and sexual intercourse as characteristic of believers who, as "sons of that age/world" refrain from the entanglements of marriage because of the nearness of the Parousia.

Irregardless of the intended meaning of Luke 20:34-36, it is clear that Marcion interpreted the passage in a very literal manner. That is to say that he regarded the act of being accounted worthy as an event which occurs in this life, with the resultant creation of two classes of men, the sons of this age/world (who marry), and

the sons of that age/world (who do not marry). The act which makes men worthy of that world and of the resurrection in Marcionite theology was baptism, a sacrament which, in conjunction with faith, enables the believer to appropriate the benefits of eschatological salvation.[1] We therefore contend that Luke 20:34-36 represents the central rationale for the ascetic baptismal requirements of Marcion,[2] who (like Menander before him) regarded that rite as the means of designating "those accounted worthy" of that age/world and of the resurrection from the dead. We must now consider the various ramifications of this passage from Marcion's Gospel for his views on the nature of future eschatological existence.

The distinction which Luke 20:34-36 makes between the "sons of this age/world" on the one hand, and the "sons of that age/world," "sons of God" or "sons of the resurrection" on the other hand, was carried over into the soteriology of Marcion. He maintained (with Paul) that those whom Christ had not redeemed continued under the dominion of the law and of the God of creation.[3] Since Marcion regarded Luke 20:34-36 as applicable to Marcionite Christians living in the present age, we are immediately faced with two problems: (1) What does Marcion mean by the term "resurrection" found twice in Luke 20:34-36? and (2) Since the one who has been baptized becomes "like the angels," what does Marcion assume to be the major characteristics of angels or angelic existence?

[1] Tertullian also considered baptism to be the divine act of approbation which bestowed salvation upon the believing initiate: "Quodsi quia Philippus tam facile tinxit eunuchum, recognitemus manifestam et exertam *dignationem* domini intercessisse" (*De baptismo* 18. 2). See also *De baptismo* 18. 3: "Sed et Paulus reuera cito tinctus est: cito enim cognouerat Simon hospes uas eum esse electionis constitutum: dei *dignatio* suas preamittit praerogatiuas!"

[2] Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 4. 38. 8: "Sic et de ipsis nuptiis responsum subuertunt, ut filii huius aeui nubunt et nubuntur de hominibus dictum sit creatoris nuptias permittentis, se autem, quos deus illius aeui, alter scilicet, dignatus sit resurrectione, iam et hic non nubere, quia non sint filii huius aeui." Since the practise of virginity or sexual abstinence was a Marcionite prerequisite for baptism, elements of Luke 20:34-36 stand out clearly as baptismal requirements from the Marcionite perspective. Cf. Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 1. 29. 1: "Quid dicam autem de disciplinae uanitate, qua sanctificat substantiam sanctam? Non tigitur apud illum caro, nisi uirgo, nisi uidua, nisi caeleps, nisi diuortio baptisma mercata, quasi non spadonibus ex nuptiis nata."

[3] Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 106. This phenomenon is characteristic of all of the texts we have examined in this study. The cultically defined community was thought to be the locus of the (partial) realization of the conditions and blessings of the salvation of the age to come.

Since our sources are unanimous in charging that Marcion denied the physical resurrection of the flesh, we might assume that he understood the term "resurrection" to apply to that element of man's nature which would survive physical death. Epiphanius objected to the application of the term "resurrection" to the soul, since the soul has not experienced death (*Panarion* 42. 5. 1). It must be remembered, however, that according to Marcion the creator God had breathed a dead soul into the first man.[1] When Tertullian argues in *Adv. Marc.* 5. 9. 1-6 that the phrase "resurrection from the dead" must refer to the physical body (he uses the terms *carnis* and *corpus* interchangeably), it is evident that his opponent referred it to something other than the physical body. Unlike Tertullian, Marcion carefully distinguished between the "flesh" and the "body" (Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 5. 15. 7-8), and maintained a belief in the final resurrection of a pneumatic body: "Et sumus adhuc in delictis, et qui in Christo dormierunt, perierunt, sane resurrecturi, sed phantasmate forsitan, sicut et Christus" (Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 3. 8. 7).[2] This anticipated resurrection of a "docetic" body is apparently based on a docetic Christology, which in turn (in my opinion) was conditioned by the presupposition that Christ's body was similar to that of angels.[3]

With Paul, Marcion held that the rising with Christ was an event which occurred at baptism, when the Spirit of God revived the immaterial part of man and infused it with new life. Christ was therefore called the "inner man" by Marcionites,[4] and they emphasized the fact that the life of Christ should be revealed in and through

[1] Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 2. 4. 4: "bonitas inflauit in animam, non mortuam, sed uiuam" (cf. *supra*, p. 198, n. 1). Ps.-Tertullian *Adv. omn. haer.* 6. 1: "Resurrectionem animae tantummodo probat, corporis negat." Although this statement was made with regard to Cerdo, the author supposes that Marcion's doctrine was a carbon copy of his teacher: "haeresim Cerdonis approbare conatus est et eadem dicere, quae ille superior haereticus ante dixerat" (Ps.-Tertullian *Adv. omn. haer.* 6. 2). Essentially the same teaching is attributed to Appeles in 6. 6: "Hic carnis resurrectionem negat; animarum solarum dicit salutem."

[2] The belief in a pneumatic resurrection of the "body" by Marcion is presupposed by his retention of large segments of I Cor. 15.

[3] Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 3. 9. 4: "Et utique, si deus tuus ueram quandoque substantiam angelorum hominibus pollicetur,—erunt enim, inquit, sicut angeli." This mode of conceptualizing the transcendental nature and significance of Jesus probably originated within Jewish Christianity; cf. Gospel of Thomas, logion 13: "You [referring to Jesus] are like a righteous angel."

[4] Hippolytus *Ref. omn. haer.* 10. 19.

their physical bodies,[1] both ethically and ascetically. Followers of Marcion understood themselves to be "sons of the resurrection" in that they experienced an ontological transformation through the sacrament of baptism which enabled them to assume some of the characteristics of future resurrection life within the framework of this present world system. While Tertullian realized that Marcionite salvation can only be completely realized in the future he did not comprehend the extent to which Marcionites thought that this eschatological salvation could be appropriated and actualized in the present: "Si de futuro erutus es, cur non et de praesenti, ut perfecte?" (*Adv. Marc.* 1. 24. 7). Tertullian's discussion of Marcion's views on both the resurrection and the nature of Christ are considerably hampered by the limitations of his Stoic framework of thought together with an unfortunate misunderstanding of precisely what Marcion meant by the term "resurrection." Operating with some of the essential presuppositions of Stoic physics, Tertullian denied that the phantasmal Christ of Marcion could have accomplished anything at all through the "Incarnation:" "Nihil solidum ab inani, nihil plenum a uacuo perfici licuit" (*Adv. Marc.* 3. 8. 4).[2]

We must conclude that Marcion's retention of the Lukan phrase "sons of the resurrection" in Luke 20:36,[3] together with the cumulative evidence that the conditions described in that passage must be observed in this world as the result of the transformation of believers through participation in the sacrament of baptism, provides positive evidence that by "resurrection" Marcion not only meant the ontological transformation of believers in the present time,[4] but also a future resurrection of the pneumatic

[1] Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 5. 11.

[2] Briefly stated, this axiom of Stoic physics is that everything capable of acting or being acted upon is corporeal (Diogenes Laertius 1. 140). See also S. Sambursky, *Physics of the Stoics* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959), pp. 56f. This Stoic framework also prompted Tertullian to insist that the soul is corporeal: "et unde sensus, si non ab anima? Denique carens anima corpus carebit et sensu" (*De anima* 17. 5; cf. 8. 3-5).

[3] In the Marcionite version of Luke 20:36, the original Lukan parallelism of the expressions "sons of God" and "sons of the resurrection" is retained. Since Marcion retained the Pauline phrase "sons of God" in Gal. 3:26 and 4:6 as descriptive of believers in the present life, presumably the phrase "sons of the resurrection" would have the same meaning.

[4] Tertullian never seems to comprehend the fact that his heretical opponents could conceive of realized resurrection life as an ontological matter rather than something experienced ethically or anticipated by faith. The

body whereby the tension of the "already" and "not yet" would finally be resolved by the elimination of worldly conditions.[1]

After having answered the first question which we raised regarding the meaning which Marcion gave to the concept "resurrection," we must now consider the second question. If the Marcionite Christians considered themselves "sons of that age/world" or "sons of the resurrection" (to use the language of Luke 20:34-36), and were therefore "like angels," what did they consider to be the major characteristics of angelic nature, and what importance did that have for Marcionite soteriology?

At a very early date in the history of early Christianity, the Incarnation was conceptualized in terms of angelic nature.[2] It goes without saying that the views of both Marcion and early theologians of the Great Church on this matter have far-reaching effects on both their Christology and soteriology.[3]

One of the significant presuppositions common to both Marcion and many of his adversaries was the belief that angels did not

passage in which he most closely reflects the actual Marcionite attitude toward the realization of resurrection life is in *De resurr. mort.* 19. 5-6: "Exinde ergo resurrectionem fide consecutos cum domino esse, quem in baptismate induerint. Hoc denique ingenio etiam in conloguiis saepe nostros dicipere consueuerunt, quasi et ipsi resurrectionem carnis admittant: 'Vae,' inquiunt, 'qui non in hac carne resurrexerit' ne statim illos perctuiant, si resurrectionem statim abnuerint."

[1] On the question of the Marcionite belief in the future life, it might be asked whether or not Marcion held to the existence of Paradise. The answer (surprisingly) is yes. Although the phrase from Luke 23:43 ("Today you will be with me in Paradise.") is absent from Marcion's gospel (Epiphanius *Scholion* 71 says Marcion struck it out), we do find that Marcion believed that Christ descended from the third heaven (Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 1. 14. 2-3), which is equated with Paradise in II Cor. 12:2-3, a Pauline passage which Marcion retained. Marcionite belief in Paradise is also attested by Tertullian's remarks in *Adv. Marc.* 5. 12. 8.

[2] See Joseph Barbel, *Christos Angelos: Die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der gelehrten und volkstümlichen Literatur des christlichen Altertums* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1964), and Adophine Bakker, "Christ an Angel? A Study of Early Christian Docetism," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,* XXXII (1933), 255-65. In the English edition of *The Formation of Christian Dogma,* p. 130, n. 1, Martin Werner has a short discussion and bibliography on the subject.

[3] Marcion's docetic Christological arguments were apparently prefaced by an attempt to demonstrate the nature of angelic beings: "In ista quaestione qui putaueris opponendos esse nobis angelos creatoris, quasi et illi in phantasmate, putatiuae utique carnis, egerint apud Abraham et Loth, et tamen uere sint et congressi et pasti et operati quod mandatum eis fuerat, primo non admitteris ad eius dei exempla, quem destruis" (Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 3. 9. 1).

possess physical bodies.[1] Although the heat of polemic in concert with Stoic presuppositions forced Tertullian into the position of defending the fact that angels do have physical bodies,[2] he is clearly an exception at this point. Irenaeus clearly believes that "sine carne enim angeli sunt" (*Adv. haer.* 3. 22; Harvey, II, 108). Justin, arguing that the manifestations of angelic beings in the Old Testament were Christophanies,[3] recognized that angels were not physical beings in the ordinary sense. In *Dialogus* 57. 2 and 131. 3, he states that they did not need to eat, and one of the terms he uses for these beings was ἀσώματος (*Apol. I* 63. 10, 16).

Christianity clearly took over many Jewish traditions concerning angels, affirming them to be sexless, immortal, having no need to eat or drink.[4] The docetic Christology of Marcion, therefore, was in all probability based on the presupposition that Christ had the nature of an angel.[5] While early Catholic theologians did not dispute the fact that men would take on the nature of angels as a consequence of the future resurrection,[6] they did dispute

[1] In Epistula Apostolorum 19, for example ,"flesh" and "angelic form" are placed in antithesis within an anti-docetic context.

[2] Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 3. 9.3: "meus autem deus, qui illam de limo sumptam in hanc reformauit qualitatem, nondum ex semine coniugali et tamen carnem, aeque potuit ex quacumque materia angeli quoque adstruxisse carnem, qui etiam mundum ex nihilo in tot ac talia corpora, et quidem uerbo, aedificauit." Cf. Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 3. 9. 5. It is interesting that Apelles felt it necessary to retreat from Marcion's original position to the admission that Christ, like angels, had a physical body, although one which was unborn (Tertullian *De carne Christi* 6; *Adv. Marc.* 3. 11. 2). The rabbis thought of angels as material beings (cf. Abelson, *Jewish Mysticism*, p. 59).

[3] See Benedict Kominiak, *The Theophanies of the Old Testament in the Writings of St. Justin* (The Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology, 2nd series, No. 14; Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1948).

[4] J. Michl, "Engel II (jüdisch)," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, V, 85. Cf. the fragment of Hippolytus preserved in the edition of Bonwetsch-Achelis, I, pt. 2, p. 254: "Men will be like the angels of God in the resurrection, i.e., in incorruption, immortality and incapacity for loss."

[5] Tertullian *De carne Christi* 14: "Sed et angelum, aiunt, gestauit Christus." The Ebionites believed that Jesus was one of the archangels who was appointed Lord over all other created beings (Schoeps, *Jewish Christianity*, p. 64).

[6] Tertullian *De resurr. carn.* 42. 4: "Abhinc enim iam definimus carnem omnimodo quidem resurrecturam atque illam ex demutatione superuentura habitum angelicum suscepturam." *Idem Adv. Marc.* 3. 24. 6: "Post cuius mille annos, intra quam aetatem concluditur santorum resurrectio pro meritis maturius uel tardius resurgentium, tunc, et mundi destructione et iudicii conflagratione commissa, superindumentum, transferemur in caeleste regnum, de quo nunc sic ideo retractatur." The futurity of this transforma-

the idea that this belief contradicted the conception of a resurrection of the flesh.[1]

We must conclude that the Marcionite understanding of angelic nature included the common Jewish and early Christian ideas of bodilessness, asexuality, immortality and without need of sustenance. These elements were not only important in the formation of Marcionite Christology, but were also, together with the quality of ethical perfection, the basis for the Marcionite conception of the ways in which eschatological salvation could be actualized in this life.

The Present Appropriation of Future Eschatological Existence

The primary difference between the asceticism of the Great Church and that of the Marcionite Church was that it was optional with the former and an absolute demand of the latter.[2] It was Marcion's absolute prohibition of marriage for the baptized which was one of the prime points of contention between himself and

---

tion was certainly emphasized by these authors in view of the heretical insistence that angelic existence could be experienced in this life (cf. Justin *Dialogus* 81. 4; Ps.-Justin *De resurr.* 3; Tertullian *De cultu fem.* 1. 2. 5; *Adv. Marc.* 3. 9. 4; 4. 39. 11; *De resurr.* 36. 5).

[1] This line of reasoning dominates Ps.-Justin *De resurr.*

[2] Chrysostom *Hom. XII on Tim.* 2, has clearly expressed this difference: "It is one thing to forbid, and another to leave one to his own free choice." In spite of Tertullian's emphasis on asceticism and continence as a Montanist, he does make it clear repeatedly that Christ's advent did not signal the absolute abolution of marriage: see *Ad uxorem* 1. 3. 1: "Sed not ideo praemiserim de libertate uetustatis et posteritatis castigatione, ut praestruam Christum separandis matrimoniis, abolendis coniunctionibus aduenisse, quasi iam hinc finem nubendi praescribam. Viderint qui inter cetera peruersitatum suarum disiungere docent carnem in euobus unam, negantes eum, qui feminam de masculo mutuatus duo corpora ex eiusdem materiae consortio sumpta rursus in se matrimonii compactione compegit." In *De monogamia* 1. 1, Tertullian (as a Montanist) takes a more mediating position: "Haeretici nuptias auferunt, psychici ingerunt. Illi nec semel, isti non semel nubunt." Yet at more candid moments (in my opinion), Tertullian reveals that he is not really as far from the position of Marcion on asceticism as he would like to suppose: "Illud enim amplius dicimus, etsiam totam et solidam uirginitatem siue contientiam Paracletus hodie determinasset, ut ne unis quidem nuptiis feruorem carnis despumare permitteret, sic quoque nihil noui inducere uideretur, ipso Domino spadonibus aperiente regna caelorum, ut et ipso spadone, ad quem spectans et apostolus properea et ipse castratus continentiam mauult" (*De monogamia* 3. 1).

the Great Church.[1] This point of contention is of great consequence, for it presupposes an *ontological* basis for Marcionite asceticism. The transformation effected in the believer through the conjunction of faith with participation in the sacrament of baptism made it impossible for him to participate in activities which (so the Marcionites believed) were symptomatic of man's fallen position.

While Paul's conception of the believer's present participation in some of the conditions of resurrection life was almost totally ethically-oriented (and therefore not realized ontologically),[2] the ethical transformation of the believer recedes into the background for Marcion, while those life-conditions which were neutrally regarded by Paul (e.g. marriage), were strongly emphasized and rejected by Marcion. While members of the Great Church too viewed ascetic practises as present conformity to future heavenly existence,[3] the motivation for asceticism was markedly different from that of the Marcionites. One of the more significant motivations for asceticism within the Great Church was rooted in the Hellenistic conception of divinization through the meritorious exhibition of self-denial in matters of sex, food, etc.[4] Continence was not the only ascetic requirement of Marcion. Meat was also forbidden, though fish was allowed.[5] The Marcionite practise of

---

[1] Chadwick, "Enkrateia," p. 352: "Das ethische Problem des 2. Jh. war, den rechtmässigen Platz der Enkrateia innerhalb der Kirche zu bestimmen. Enthaltsamkeit wurde allgemein als der Weg zur Vollkommenheit angesehen. Die Trennungslinie zwischen Orthodoxie u. Häresie wird sichtbar, wenn die Enthaltsamen beanspruchen, die alleinige Kirche Christi zu sein, u. daher alle verheirateten Christen aus der Kirche ausschliessen."

[2] Werner, *The Formation of Christian Dogma*, p. 165, comes very close to claiming that in Paul the realization of resurrection life is ontologically appropriated.

[3] Tertullian *Ad uxorem* 1. 4. 4-5: "Sic aeternum sibi bonum, donum domini, occupauerunt, ac iam in terris non nubendo de familia angelica deputantur. Talium exemplis feminarum ad aemulationem te continentiae exercens spiritali affectione carnalem illam concupiscentiam humabis, temporalia et uolatica desideria formae uel aetatis immortalium bonorum compensatione delendo."

[4] *Supra*, p. 196, n. 2. This motivation is evident in Tertullian's Montanist attitude toward marriage expressed in *Ad uxorem* 1. 7. 1: "Nobis continentia ad instrumentum aeternitatis demonstrata est a domino, salutis deo, ad testimonium fidei, ad commendationem carnis istius exhibendae superuenturo idumento incorruptibilitatis, ad sustinendam nouissime uoluntatem dei."

[5] Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 149f. Harnack quotes Eznik to the effect that fish was allowed because Luke 24:42 records that Jesus in a post-resurrection appearance to his disciples ate fish with them (*ibid.*, pp. 373* and 378*).

using water in place of wine in the observance of the eucharist has led to the supposition (probably ill-founded) that abstention from wine was also practised.[1]

We have already alluded to the fact that the sacraments of the Marcionite church closely resembled those of the Great Church in both form and content.[2] We have also stressed the fact that an adequate treatment of Marcionite soteriology cannot omit the place of the sacraments alongside that of faith as the means for appropriating the benefits of eschatological salvation within the framework of this present life.[3] In an important polemical passage in Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 1. 28. 2-3,[4] the Carthaginian theologian elaborates four aspects of Marcion's interpretation of baptism: (1) remission of sins,[5] (2) deliverance from death, (3) regeneration of man, and (4) bestowal of the Holy Spirit. If these indeed are the salvific benefits of Marcionite sacramental theology, then they are identical with those of the Great Church. Yet Marcion, I believe, went beyond this point and asserted that through bap-

---

See also Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 1. 14. 4: "reprobas et mare, sed usque ad copias eius, quas sanctiorem cibum deputas." Tertullian *De ieiunio* 15. 1-2 mentions Marcion's prohibition of animal food.

[1] Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 149f., conjectures that wine was prohibited, but gives no real support for this contention. The use of water in place of wine in the eucharist (in addition to alleviating the great expense of wine), may be an extremely old practise showing that the earliest Christian meal celebrations were in actuality a continuation of table fellowship with Jesus and not re-enactments of Jesus' Passover meal. In first century Palestine, wine was drunk only on festive occasions; cf. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, pp. 50ff., 66, 115.

[2] *Supra*, p. 200.

[3] *Supra*, pp. 201f.

[4] "Cuius non statum, non condicionem, non naturam, non ullum ordinem uideo consistere, iam nec ipsum fidei eius sacramentum. Cui enim rei baptisma quoque apud eum exigitur? Si remissio delictorum est, quomodo uidebitur delicta dimittere qui non uidebitur retinere, quia, si retineret, iudicaret? Si absolutio mortis est, quomodo absoluet a morte qui non deuinxit ad mortem? Damnasset enim, si a primordio deuinxisset. Si regeneratio est hominis, quomodo regenerat qui non generauit? Iteratio enim non competit ei, a quo quid nec semel factum est. Si consecutio est spiritus sancti, quomodo spiritum adtribuet qui animam non prius contulit? Quia suffectura est quodammodo spiritus animae. Signat igitur hominem numquam apud se resignatum, lauat hominem numquam apud se coinquinatum, et in hoc totum salutis sacramentum carnem mergit exortem salutis?"

[5] The notice in Epiphanius *Panarion* 42. 3. 6. to the effect that Marcionites baptized a person up to three times is apparently based on rumor; his short discussion of Marcionite multiple baptisms (42. 3. 8-9) reveals that the chief motivation is to obtain forgiveness for sins following post-baptismal lapses.

tism the spiritual mode of resurrection existence was appropriated and expedited through an inner transformation which had attendant physical or ontological effects. It was in this way that Christ (the "inner man") must be manifest in the lives of the faithful. Tertullian's insistence on applying II Cor. 4:10 to the *future* ("that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our bodies"), and interpreting the verse as a guarantee of the bodily resurrection, clearly reveals that Marcion applied that same passage to the present experience of believers (Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 5. 11). Similarly, Tertullian's insistence that I Cor. 15:49 ("as we have borne the image of the earthy, so we shall bear the image of the heavenly") refers to a mental attitude rather than the condition of the resurrection mode of existence in the present time, makes it quite probable that Marcion held the opposite.[1]

The foregoing discussion, basically oriented about the significance of Luke 20:34-36 for the soteriology of Marcion of Sinope, has been an attempt to demonstrate the probability of the hypothesis with which we began our discussion. Marcion's ascetic baptismal requirements indicate that he regarded that sacrament to be the means of appropriating and initiating an ontologically realized form of eschatological salvation necessitating present conformity to certain preconceived modes of future heavenly existence. This hypothesis certainly is not novel, in that it can be applied to the theologies of any number of second century Gnostics; however, so far as I know, it has never been applied to the theology of Marcion. The aspect of our hypothesis which still remains to be discussed is the demonstration of the phenomenological similarity and genetic relationship of the eschatologically motivated asceticism of Marcion with that of early Syrian Christianity.

---

[1] Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 5. 10. 10-11: "Et ideo iam ad exhortationem spei caelestis: sicut portauimus, inquit, imaginem terreni, portemus et imaginem caelestis, non ad substantiam illam referens resurrectionis, sed ad praesentis temporibus disciplinam. 'Portemus' enim, inquit, non 'portabimus', praeceptiue, non promissiue, uolens nos sicut ipse incessit ita incedere, et a terreni, id est ueteris, hominis imagine abscendere, quae est carnalis operatio."

Ascetic Motivations in Early Syrian Christianity and Marcion

Phenomenologically, there is a striking similarity between Marcion's posture with respect to baptism and that of early Syrian Christianity.[1] Studies since F. C. Burkitt have emphasized the fact that continence was a prerequisite for baptism in certain areas of eastern Christianity at a very early date.[2] Since the Roman church regarded this absolute condition for baptism as heretical, her increasing influence together with the gradual homogenization of Levantine Christianity resulted in its abandonment after the time of Aphraates.[3] The phenomenological similarity between Marcionite and Syriac churches accounts at least in part for the widespread and early popularity of Marcionism in the East.[4] It would not be superfluous, then, to consider whether Marcionite and early Syrian Christian asceticism might not in fact be historically and genetically related.

We have already decided that once a predominantly positive motivation is posited for Marcionite asceticism, the assumption that such asceticism is based on the Hellenistic dualism of flesh and spirit becomes problematic.[5] The Marcionite belief in the existence of Paradise,[6] together with the conception of a final resurrection of the pneumatic body,[7] presupposed both a vertical (or spatial) dualism and a horizontal (or temporal) dualism. It is clear that the very conception of a spiritual resurrection body is inconsistent with the assumption that the Hellenistic flesh-spirit dichotemy lies at the base of Marcion's soteriology and anthropolo-

---

[1] The opinion of Walter Bauer that the church at Edessa had been founded by followers of Marcion (*Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*, pp. 26ff.), must now be abandoned; cf. Barnard, "The Origins and Emergence of the Church in Edessa," p. 161.

[2] F. C. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity* (London: John Murray, 1904), pp. 118-54. Early opposition to Burkitt's thesis was expressed by Hugo Koch, "Taufe und Askese in der alten östsyrischen Kirche," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XII (1911), 37-69. Burkitt's position is regarded as axiomatic by de Zwaan, "The Edessene Origin of the Odes of Solomon," pp. 285-302. Burkitt's essential thesis has been somewhat modified and buttressed by Vööbus, *Celibacy*, and *idem*, *History of Asceticism*.

[3] Vööbus, *Celibacy*, p. 48.

[4] Vööbus, *History of Asceticism*, I, 46.

[5] *Supra*, pp. 201f.

[6] *Supra*, p. 209, n. 1.

[7] *Supra*, pp. 201ff.

gy.[1] We must rather suppose that a growing superstructure of Hellenistic dualism (which had a pervasive influence on all early Christian movements) found comfortable continuity with a foundation of early Christian spatial-temporal dualism. To extend the metaphor further, one might also say that the foundation itself rests on the bedrock of Jewish apocalyptic thought.

In our opinion, the essential presuppositions for Marcion's soteriology do not lay in Hellenistic metaphysical dualism, but rather in the eschatologically oriented soteriology of Jewish Christianity, whose conceptual framework was that of late Judaism.[2] Many of the obviously Jewish elements were carefully eliminated by Marcion, but the basic conceptual framework remained intact. The way in which Marcion conceptualizes eschatological salvation is strongly rooted in the Paradise motif, and particularly in the protological significance of Jewish Adam-traditions. To briefly recapitulate the essential elements of that tradition, it was believed that Adam was originally created as an immortal heavenly being of immense stature, clothed with radiant celestial garments and was placed by God in Paradise (the third heaven). As a result of disobedience, Adam was expelled from the heavenly Paradise to earth, with the consequent loss of all those celestial benefits and modes of existence which he had enjoyed: loss of immortality, diminution of stature and surrender of the radiant celestial garments. The conviction that Adam and Eve neither ate meat nor experienced sexual intercourse[3] before the Fall seems to have provided Jewish Christianity with a motivation for asceticism,[4]

---

[1] Werner, *The Formation of Christian Dogma*, p. 50, notes that Marcion was far less influenced by Hellenistic philosophy than were many early Catholic theologians, and Kretschmar, "Ursprung frühchristlicher Askese," p. 29, applies this to Marcionite dualism: "Die Ablehnung der Ehe durch die Markioniten und die Abstinenzforderungen anderer Gruppen weisen auf einen Dualismus zurück, der sich erheblich von dem der hellenistischen Philosophie unterscheidet."

[2] *Supra*, pp. 34-42.

[3] Both of these "pre-Fall" characteristics are not uncommon in comparative religions (cf. Eliade, *Shamanism*, p. 99). In an improvised speech by an early member of the human race, eating flesh is declared "against nature" (παρὰ φύσιν) in Plutarch *De esu carnium* 1. 2. Asexuality was similarly believed to be a characteristic of mankind in the primordial past (cf. *Poimandres* 15).

[4] While Jewish sources are generally silent on the question of the relationship between the Fall of Adam and the sexuality of mankind, we do find this relationship explicitly treated in II Baruch 56:6: "For when he [Adam]

in that the very practise of these ascetic traits was an indication that the future eschatological restoration of man to Paradise was

transgressed . . . the begetting of children was brought about, and the passion of parents produced." Rab (died ca. A. D. 247) is quoted in b. Berachoth 17a: "In the world to come there is neither eating nor drinking, no marital relations . . ." This conception of the future world is obviously modelled after protological conditions. In Samaritan eschatology, this connection between conditions in the world to come and the world as it once was in made explicit: "Know that the state of those who will dwell hereafter in the Garden of Eden, will be like unto the state of Adam in the Garden of Eden, when God put him there; they will live there like unto the angels of heaven, in splendour and glory, clothed in light and free from every evil thing, pure, free from defilement, holy, no evil inclinations among them, men and women without carnal intercourse, just as our father Adam and Eve, whom he did not know until after he had left this place; for after their going out from the Garden the Lord says, 'And Adam knew his wife Eve.' " (Gaster, *Samaritan Eschatology*, p. 182). In Christian literature the thought is often expressed that Eve was a virgin prior to the Fall, implying that human sexuality itself had its origin with the Fall of Man (Justin *Dialogus* 100. 5; Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 3. 32. 1; 3. 35. 1; 5. 19. 1; Tertullian *De virg. vel.* 5. 1; *De monogamia* 5. 5: "quando nouissimus Adam, id est Christus, innuptus in totum, quod etiam primus Adam ante exilium"; *De exhort. cast.* 1. 3f.; Epiphanius *Panarion* 78. 18. 7).

Commenting on asceticism in Jewish Christianity, H. J. Schoeps notes that Jewish tradition states that Adam (and other ante-diluvians) did not eat animal flesh, basing his claim on b. Sanhedrin 59a, the comments of Ibn Ezra and Nachmanides on Gen. 1:29 and Philo of Biblos in Eusebius *Praeparatio* 1. 106 (*Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1949], p. 190). In addition to these references noted by Schoeps there are a number of others within Jewish literature which verify the same conception. In b. Sanhedrin 59b, for example, this ante-diluvian prohibition is clearly stated: "Rab Judah said in Rab's name: Adam was not permitted to eat flesh, for it is written '[Behold I have given you all the herbs, etc.] to you it shall be for food, and to all the beasts of the earth,' implying, but the beasts of the earth shall not be for you. But with the advent of the sons of Noah, it was permitted, for it is said, '[Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you;] even as the green herb I have given you all things." Cf. also Genesis Rabbah 34. 13, and Leviticus Rabbah 13. 2.

Similar views are given by Tertullian in justification of asceticism; these traditions were probably derived from Judaism. In *De monogamia* 5. 3-4, Tertullian observes, "Et adeo in Christo omnia reuocantur ad initium, ut et fides reuersa sit a circumcisione ad integritatem carnis illius, sicut ab initio fuit, et libertas ciborum et sanguinis solius abstinentia, sicut ab initio fuit, et repudii cohibitio, quod ab initio non fuit, et postreme totus homo in paradisum reuocantur, ubi ab initio fuit. Cur ergo uel monoganum illo (non) debeat Adam referre, qui non potest tam integrum praestare quam inde dimissus est?" And again in *De ieiunio* 5. 1, Tertullian says, "Denique ubi iam et familiaris populus allegi deo coepit et restitutio hominis imbui potuit, tunc leges disciplinaeque omnes impositae, etiam quae decerperent uictum, ademptis quisbusdam ueluti immundis, quo facilius aliquando ieiunia toleraret homo perpetua in quibusdam abstinentia usus."

being experienced and actualized (at least to a limited degree) within the framework of present worldly conditions. Since Adam was thought to have resembled the angels of God, it was thought that after the resurrection the righteous would be transformed in angelic form as a necessary prelude to readmission into Paradise.[1] In Syrian Christianity it was the virtue of virginity or celibacy in combination with the sacrament of baptism which formed a realized experience of resurrection existence.[2]

The historical and genetic link between Marcion and early Syrian Christianity is not only to be found through the common influence of Jewish Christianity, but specifically through the personal influence of Cerdo the Syrian Gnostic.[3] While early ecclesiastical heresiologists are unanimous in naming Cerdo as the mentor of Marcion,[4] Harnack and others have wished to limit any possible influence which Cerdo may have had on Marcion to two doctrinal areas: (1) the belief in the essentially evil nature of flesh and matter, and (2) the consequent limitation of redemption to the soul or spirit of man.[5] The very fact that Harnack considers both of these elements to be "Fremdkörper" in the theology of Marcion,[6] together with his expressed desire to preserve the originality of his "second century Luther," [7] makes his judgment questionable in this matter.[8]

Certainly the phenomenological similarity between the ascetic and baptismal practises of the early Syrian church and the Mar-

[1] *Supra*, p. 40, n. 1.

[2] Vööbus, *History of Asceticism*, I, 103f., quotes Ephrem *De Paradiso* 6 in support of this point.

[3] Cerdo's Syrian origin is mentioned by Epiphanius *Panarion* 41. 1. 1, and Filastrius *Diversarum hereseon liber* 44. 1-2.

[4] Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 3. 4. 3 (Harvey, II, 18); Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 1. 2. 3; 4. 17. 11; Ps.-Tertullian *Adv. omn. haer.* 6. 2; Ps.-Tertullian *Carmen adv. Marc.* 1. 141; 3. 286; Cf. Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 31*-39*; Wilhelm Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Heft 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907), pp. 109f.

[5] Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 98, 104.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 98.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[8] Lietzmann stresses the lack of clarity which exists with regard to the exact relationship which obtained between Cerdo and Marcion. He concludes that Irenaeus and Hippolytus placed the two heretics in a close relationship primarily because of their propensity to find (or invent) genealogical relationships between the various heretics (*The Beginnings of the Christian Church*, p. 250). Blackman finds that Cerdo was very influential in the formation of Marcion's theology (*Marcion and His Influence*, pp. 68f.).

cionite church, together with the historical link with Syria provided by Cerdo would seem to indicate that Marcion had more than merely superficial links with aspects of Syrian Christianity. The importance of baptism as a cultic means for actualizing the resurrection life of the future ontologically in early Syrian Christianity is further demonstrated by the fact that Menander—the supposed successor of the Syrian Gnostic Simon Magus—maintained that when his followers were baptized into him, they obtained the resurrection together with instant immortality.[1]

Conclusions

In summary, then, it may be maintained that there is indeed strong evidence to support the hypothesis with which we began our consideration of the question of whether or not eschatological salvation was realized or actualized in the present time in the thought of Marcion of Sinope. After considering the crucial implications of Luke 20:34-36 for the soteriology of Marcion and his followers, we must conclude that his ascetic baptismal prerequisites were predicated upon the assumption that the believing participant in the sacrament of baptism experienced an individually and ontologically realized form of eschatological salvation conceptualized as the resurrection existence of the future world. The reality of this experience necessitated strict conformity in the present time to the conditions of eschatological life as understood by the Marcionite church.

---

[1] Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 1. 17 (Harvey, I, 195): "Dare quoque per eam quae a se doceatur, magicam scientiam addidit, ut et ipsos qui mundum fecerunt, vincat Angelos. Resurrectionem enim per id quod est in eum baptisma accipere ejus discipulos, et ultra non posse mori, sed perseverare non senescentes et immortales." Tertullian *De anima* 50. 1: "sed haeretici magi Menandri Samaritani furor conspuatur dicentis mortem ad suos non modo non pertinere, uerum nec peruenire: in hoc scilicet se a superna et arcana potestate legatum, ut immortales et incorruptibiles et statim resurrectionis compotes fiant, qui baptisma eius induerint." Ps.-Tertullian *Adv. omn. haer.* 1, notes that only those who were baptized in the name of Menander could possess salvation, and the same statement is made by Justin *Apol. I* 26. 4, but without reference to baptism. See also Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 3. 26.

SUMMARY

The purpose of the foregoing study has been to demonstrate, through the examination of a series of interrelated texts and literary testimonia, that the phenomenon of "realized eschatology" within early Christianity had its primary origin and setting within the cultic worship and life of the various individuals and groups which produced the extant evidence. Apart from the recognition of this fact, realized eschatology as a datum in early Christian religious thought cannot be adequately understood.

One difficulty which we have encountered from time to time during the course of this study has been the problem of more precisely defining the "cultic setting" presupposed by the literary evidence. Unfortunately for the modern historian of early Christianity, as for the historian of the ancient Israelite religion, literary evidence usually presupposes rather than explicitly states the settings in the worship and life of the people from which the literature ultimately arose. Any reconstruction of early Christian worship is in danger of foundering between the Scylla of levelling the extant evidence by trying to produce a unified picture from sources with markedly diverse origins, and the Charybdis of tacitly assuming that what can be learned about the worship and life of one regional variant of Christian worship and life also obtained for other regions and times as well. The present study, with a few qualified exceptions, has made neither assumption. Each body of literature or ancient testimonia was examined in relative independence of others, and what could be said about the "cultic setting" of eschatological salvation in a particular writing was done so only on the basis of clues present in the writing or collection of testimonia itself.

The application of this thesis to a select group of early Christian and late Jewish documents was not made with the view that here we find a completely unique element in comparative religions. The introduction to this study has underlined the fact that precisely the opposite was the case. In view of the fact that realized protology or realized eschatology (functionally equivalent concepts) is a common phenomenon in comparative religions, and in view of the fact that it is precisely within cultic ritual that the worshippers are

taken up (to use Mircea Eliade's phrase) "in illo tempore", it seemed reasonable to suppose that the same or analogous phenomenon might be expected to recur within the religious rituals of primitive Christianity. The *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* at the beginning of the present century erred in the direction of ignoring the unique elements of the primitive Christian religion by overemphasizing its dependence and indebtedness to religious and cultural movements and ideologies in its Oriental and Graeco-Roman evironment. The present study has attempted to examine select phases of early Christianity from the standpoint of the phenomenology of religions generally, and the religious movements in its environment in particular, all the while granting unique elements to the Christian movement, elements which are highlighted by a lack of continuity with the immediate religious and cultural backgrounds. In this respect we find ourselves more in sympathy with the so-called "socio-historical" method or environmental criticism practised at the University of Chicago more than a generation ago.

We have found, I believe, that each of the major ways in which the phenomenon of "realized eschatology" manifests itself in the language appropriate to each body of texts or variety of Christianity represented therein can be placed within a reconstructed cultic setting of that particular community. Before briefly summarizing some of the salient results of the foregoing study, one general insight should be succinctly stated. There seems to be a direct correlation between the genre of a particular document of early Christian literature and the frequency with which aspects of realized eschatology find expression within that document. Various ways of conceptualizing realized eschatology are found with much greater frequency in hymnic materials (the Qumran Ḥodayoth, the Odes of Solomon, the hymns of the Apocalypse, etc.), and with much less frequency in such occasional and extra-cultic literature as the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch. While it would be a truism to say that no single document of early Christianity can be regarded as an exhaustive index to the thought of its author or the community which produced it, the modern scholar needs to keep that fact constantly in mind.

Let us now briefly summarize the results of the foregoing study:

1. In the Qumran Community, the great part of the evidence for the fact that the benefits of eschatological salvation were actualized within the present experience of the community is found in their

religious hymns. It is within these hymns, or Ḥodayoth, that elements of the Paradise tradition are found and aspects of this tradition are used to conceptualize eschatological salvation as a present reality within the experience of the cultic community. According to the probable thesis of Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, five specific eschatological acts belong to the present experience of the community: (1) resurrection, (2) new creation, (3) communion with angels, (4) deliverance from the final power of the realm of death, and (5) proleptic eschatological transference to heaven. In addition, the presence of eschatological salvation manifested itself in the present possession of the Spirit of God, the possession of knowledge and the eschatological realities of joy, forgiveness of sins and the cessation of sorrow. Side by side with imagery drawn from the Paradise tradition is the peculiarly Israelite belief that the end time will be characterized by a national regathering; this expectation was particularly expressed in the sacral meals of the community which were regarded as anticipations of the final Messianic banquet.

2. In our consideration of the phenomenon of realized eschatology within the Fourth Gospel, we were primarily concerned with the significance of that eschatology for the Johannine community, i.e., the specific function which it had within the religious community together with the modes or ways in which eschatological salvation was thought to be a factor in present experience. We discovered that the Johannine Jesus was primarily the product of the retrojected religious beliefs, values and aspirations of the community. Since Jesus possessed the attributes which were essential to the Christian life, or the life of the community considered as a whole, one may through an analysis of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel find out a great deal more about the Johannine Community than about Jesus of Nazareth. If eschatological slavation was realized or actualized in the Johannine Jesus, one could argue that it was similarly realized or actualized within the Johannine community. With regard to "eternal life", the primary Johannine term for eschatological salvation, and "judgment," the primary Johannine term for "realized damnation," both of these eschatological acts are mediated to the community through the *alter ego* of the exalted Jesus, the Spirit-Paraclete. As the Johannine Jesus himself possessed life and the authority to pronounce judgment, so the Johannine community possessed this gift of life

and the corollary ability to pronounce summary judgment upon those who do not respond positively to the proclamation of the message of God. Both elements are found in the Johannine eschatological pronouncements (*supra*, pp. 109-13), which appear to be utterances of the exalted Jesus speaking through prophetic representatives within a setting of eucharistic worship. Eternal life is an irrevocable and permanent possession of the community, as it was of Jesus, since the community continues on in the world as an incarnation of the exalted Jesus. With regard to the "coming" of Jesus which is referred to in the Farewell Discourses, we advanced the hypothesis that while a literal Parousia is not totally out of view, the primary reference was to a "coming" of Jesus which recurred within the context of cultic worship. Whether this phenomenon was an actual cultic Christophany in vision form (as John 1:51 seems to imply), or whether this cultic "coming" was mediated through prophetic cult personnel through whom the exalted Jesus pronounced both blessing and cursing, life and judgment, there seems to be ample evidence within the Fourth Gospel and allied bodies of early Christian literature that this was a real feature of Christian worship in this geographical area. Apart from those passages which refer to the "coming" of Jesus are sections such as John 1:51, where traditional Christian Parousia language and imagery is used, but without reference to a literal future Parousia. Thus the basic categories of realized eschatology within the Fourth Gospel, eternal life, judgment and the "coming" of Jesus find a most appropriate setting within the cultic worship and life of the Johannine community.

3. In spite of the close relationship which exists between the Fourth Gospel and the Letters of Ignatius, we found in our investigation of Ignatius than an emphasis on the present realization of eschatological salvation occupies the margins of his thought at best. For Ignatius, the basic categories of eschatological salvation (i.e., life, resurrection, immortality, "to attain God," etc.) are only present realities in a radically conditional way. It is only when a person has remained "in Jesus Christ" to the end of his life that eschatological salvation can be said to be his possession. Ignatius clearly presupposes that the cultic community as authentically constituted by the monarchical episcopate mediates the blessings of eschatological salvation, and that thereby such blessings are experienced as present realities through continued participation in the

cult. Thr present possession of eschatological salvation so strongly emphasized in the Fourth Gospel seems to be the result of a strong emphasis on the cultic community as the locus of these blessings, while for Ignatius his own preoccupation with whether or not he will in fact "attain to God" has soconditioned his statements regarding the present actualization of savation that such possession cannot in any sense be regarded as irrevocable.

4. Since the Odes of Solomon appear to be prophetic or charismatic hymns of praise set in a context of cultic worship in early Syrian Christianity and are therefore primarily expressions of the experience of the community at worship, the present actualization of eschatological salvation finds a particularly strong emphasis, an emphasis unequalled in early Christian literature apart from the Fourth Gospel. As in the evidence drawn from the Dead Sea Scrolls, we found that here we have a combination of imagery drawn from both the Paradise tradition (the primary emphasis) and the historically-conditioned imagery of final salvation drawn from the Israelite belief in a final salvific regathering of the people of God. The primary mode of conceptualizing eschatological salvation as a present reality in the experience of the community under the leadership of its cultic personnel is the corporate "Himmelfahrt", in which the community sees itself present in the heavenly world in final worship of God in the presence of angelic beings. This actualization of eschatological salvation, also conceptualized as "rest," provided the proper setting for the reactualization of ideal conditions as they existed before the Fall: (1) freedom from disease and pain, (2) investiture with a celestial garment of immortality, (3) possession of eternal life or immortality, (4) possession of a crown or garland, (5) admission to the presence of the Lord in the company of the redeemed, and (6) joyful participation with angels in the praise and worship of God in Paradise.

5. Finally in the fragmentary writings of Marcion of Sinope we found evidence to substantiate the fact that eschatological salvation conceptualized in terms of a present experience of resurrection life based on an ontological transformation of the believer occurred at baptism. This transformation was conceptualized as an angelic mode of existence which necessitated present conformity to the eschatological mode of angelic life in terms of mandatory celibacy together with other forms of ascetic practises. Marcionite asceticism, therefore, at least for Marcion himself, was not predicated upon the

Hellenistic dualism of flesh and spirit, but rather upon the supposition of Jewish Christianity that the conditions of blessedness which existed prior to the Fall were reinstated and actualized through the coming of Christ into the world of man.

INDEX OF AUTHORS [1]

Abbott, E. A. 167n, *175n*, 185n
Abelson, J. *41n*, 210n
Abrahams, I. *78n*
Abramowski, R. 167n, *172n*, 175ff., 184n
Adam, A. *150n*, 167n, 169n, 191n
Albright, W. F. *67n*
Altendorf, H. D. *24n*
Aune, D. E. *30n*, 81n

Bacon, B. W. *49n*, 56n, 61n, 68, 68n, 99n, 105n, 109n
Bakker, A. *209n*
Barbel, J. *209n*
Barnard, L. W. *24n*, 215n
Barrett, C. K. 55, *55n*, 56n, 58, 61n, 92, 92n, 100n, 118n, 129n, 130n, 190n
Bartsch, H. W. *26n*, 147n, 156n, 158n, 160, 165
Batiffol, P. 167n
Bauer, W. 24, *27n*, 129, 129n, *139n*, 146n, 149n, 159n, 162n, *166n*, 167n, 171n, 173n, 182n, 215n
Baumgartner 167n
Baus, K. *187n*
Beasley-Murray, G. R. 53, *53n*, 57n, 116n, 127
Becker, H. *27n*, 72, *72n*, 175n
Benoit, A. *145n*, 146n, 158n
Berger, K. *124n*
Bernard, J. H. *118n*, 129n, 133n, 167n, 169n, 175n, 183n
Betz, H. D. *2n*
Betz, O. *32n*, 35n, 71n, *173n*, 196n
Bianchi, U. *26n*, *198n*
Bieder, W. *18n*, 34n
Bietenhard, H. *19n*
Black, M. *41n*, 42n, 108n
Blackman, E. C. *200n*, 218n
Blank, J. *50n*, 84ff., 103n, 108n, 111n, 118n, 125n
Böcher, O. *33n*, 36n, 43n, 58n, 116n, 122n
Boismard, M. E. 52, *52n*
Bonwetsch, G. N. *201n*
Borgen, P. 56, *56n*, 68f., 91, 91n
Bornkamm, G. *49n*
Bousset, W. *5n*, 11n, 13n, 16n, 17n, 23n, 47n, 61, 61n, 63n, 77n, 94n, 142,n 153n, *218n*
Bouyer, L. *11n*
Braaten, C. E. *2n*
Brandenburger, E. *39n*
Brandon, S. G. F. *8n*, 16n, *190n*
Braun, F. M. 25n, *137n*, *170n*, 172n, 173f., 176n, 184n
Braun, H. *25n*, 29n, 31n, 34n
Brown, R. E. *31n*, 48n, 58n, 61n, 63n, 64n, 72n, *83n*, *86n*, 91n, 96n, 104n, 105n, 114n, 119n, 120n, 133n
Brown, M. *141n*, 159n
Bruce, F. F. *71n*
Bruston, C. 167n
Buchsel, F. *116n*
Buhl, F. 171n
Bultmann, R. 2, 10, *10n*, 17n, *20n*, 27n, 35n, *46f.*, 49ff., 56, 56n, 58n, 59n, 60ff., 69n, 71n, 72, 72n, 77n, 79n, 87, 90n, 91n, 94n, 103n, 104n, 107n, 112, 118n, 121n, 125n, 129, 129n,137, 138n, 146n, 147n, 152-57, 161n, 171n, 177n, 183n, 188n, 190n
Burkitt,F. C. 167n, *170n*, 215, *215n*
Burney, C. F. *111n*, 167n, 169n

Cadbury, H. J. *93n*
Campenhausen, H. von *182n*
Carmignac, J. *25n*, *167n*, 168n, 173, 173n
Case, S. J. *74n*
Chadwick, H. *144n*, *151n*, 196n, 212n
Charles, R. H. *39n*, 49n, 58n, 114ff., 162n
Charlesworth, J. H. *26n*
Clemen, C. 171n
Colson, J. 148n

---

[1]) Page numbers in italics indicate the presence of full bibliographical data on the work cited.

Connolly, R. H. 167n, *174n*, *188n*
Conybeare, F. C. *177n*
Conzelmann, H. *10n*, 35n, 71n, *92n*, *104n*, 138n
Corell, A. 54, *54n*, 85ff.
Corwin, V. *153n*
Cross, F. M. *41n*, *91n*
Cullmann, O. *14n*, *17n*, 26, *30n*, *39n*, *48n*, 54, 54n, 65n, 90n, 128n, 179n, 183n

Dahl, N. A. 30n, *63n*, 91n, 108n
Dalman, G. *92n*
Dana, H. E. and Mantey, J. R. *143n*
Danièlou, J. *25n*, 171n, 172n, 173, 187n
Davies, J. G. *138n*
Davies, W. D. 26, *35n*, 78n
de Faye, E. *199n*
Deissmann, A. *5n*, 9f., 77n
Delcor, M. *32n*
Delling, G. *16n*, 177n, 178n, 179n
de Vaux, R. *10n*, 19n
de Zwaan, J. *25n*, 167n, 172, 172n, 174n, 175n, 215n
Dibelius, M. *66n*, 167n, *169n*, 171n, 175n, 180n
Dietzel, A. *178n*
Dodd, C. H. 1, 3, *3n*, 17n, 30n, 56n, 58, *59n*, 60f., 63, 65, 65n, 67n, 105n, 116, 116n, 125n, 129, 129n, 130n
Duensing, H. *91n*, 171n
Dupont-Sommer, A. *38n*, 186n

Ebeling, G. *124n*
Eissfeldt O. *166n*
Eliade, M. *8n*, 19n, 20n, *40n*, *41n*, 172n, 183n, 216n, 221
Ellis, E. E. *54n*, 56n, 58n, *130n*

Fascher, E. *180n*
Flemming, J. *91n*
Florovsky, G. 1, 3n
Foerster, W. *152n*, 162n, 164n
Ford, J. M. *180n*
Fortna, R. T. *66n*
Frankenberg, W. 167n, *174n*, 183n
Freed, E. D. *69n*
Fridrichsen, A. 63n
Fries, S. A. *177n*
Fuller, R. *67n*
Funk, R. *4n*
Furnish, V. P. *21n*

Gärtner, B. *20n*
Gaster, M. *40n*, 116n, 217n
Ginzberg, L. *39n*
Glover, T. R. *147n*
Goedhart, H. *42n*
Goltz, E. von der *136n*, 160n, 165
Grant, R. M. *25n*, *28n*, *55n*, 59n, *123n*, *136n*, *137n*, *139n*, 146n, 147n, 148n, 153n, 155f., 162n, 169n, 170n, 171, *171n*
Gressmann, H. 167n, 171n
Grimme, H. *167n*, 168n
Gunkle, H. 167n, *169n*, 171n, 175, 175n
Güttgemanns, E. *18n*, *140n*
Guy, H. A. *177n*

Haenchen, E. 1, 3n
Hahn, F. *88n*
Harnack, A. *47n*, 60n, 71n, 167n, 168n, *169n*, 174n, *196n*, 198n, 199ff., 206n, 212n, 213n, 218, 218n
Harris, R. 166, 167n, *170n*
Hartingsveld, L. van *50n*, 53, *53n*, 57n, 61n, 64n, 103n, 106, 106n, 118n, 119n, 120, 120n, 128n
Harvey, W. W. *6n*
Hauck, F. *131n*
Heitmüller, W. 63n
Higgins, A. J. B. *67n*, 98n, 125n
Hill, D. *58n*, 105n
Holl, K. 71n
Holtzmann, H. J. 52, *52n*
Hora, E. 171n
Hoskyns, E. 1
Howard, W. *48n*, 61n, *118n*, 129n
Huppenbauer, H. W. *108n*

Jeremias, G. *71n*
Jeremias, J. 1, *3n*, *17n*, *39n*, 42n, *150n*, 203n, 213n
Jonas, H. 171n

Käsemann, E. 15n, *48n*, *52n*, 56, 56n, 61, 61n, 73, 73n, 75f., 78n, 84, 84n, 88, 88n, 110, *110n*, 115, *115n*, 116, 123f., 155, *189n*
Kittel, G. *166n*, 167n, 174n,
Klijn, A. F. J. *25n*, 167n 168n, *169n*, 170n, 171n, 183n, 184n
Knopf, R. *180n*
Knox, J. *77n*
Koch, H. *215n*

Koester, H. *60n*, *136n*, 140n, 148n
Kominiak, B. *210n*
Kraft, R. A. *182n*
Kraus, H. J. *89n*
Kredel, E. M. *10n*
Kretschmar, G. *196n*, 216n
Krüger, G. 171n
Kuhn, H.-W. 31, *31n*, 33-37, 42, 42n, 116n
Kuhn, K. G. *41n*
Kümmel, W. G. 3, *3n*, *4n*, *25n*, 26n, 30n, 47n, 87, 169n
Kundsin, K. *67n*, *72n*, *76n*, *80n*, 129, 129n
Kuntz, J. K. *90n*, 100n

Ladd, G. E. *4*, *54n*
Lake, K. *93n*
Lampe, G. W. H. *16n*
Leclerq, H. *166n*
Leeuw, G. van der *7n*
Lentzen-Deis, F. L. *92n*
Lewy, H. *146n*, 167n, 171n
Licht, J. *32n*, 35n
Lietzmann, H. *11n*, 199n, 200, 218n
Lightfoot, J. B. *142n*, 153n
Lindars, B. *69n*
Lindblom, J. *89n*, 91n, 92n, 95n, *105n*, 107n, 177n, 180n
Lohmeyer, E. *178n*
Lohse, E. *49n*
Lundström, G. *2n*, 4

Maier, J. *33n*
Malatesta, E. *46n*, 67n
Manson, T. W. *203n*
Mansoor, Menahem *32n*
Marmorstein, A. *187n*
Marshall, I. H. *203n*
Martin, R. P. *14n*
Martyn, J. L. 74, *74n*, 75, 75n, 77, 81n
Mathews, S. *74n*, 77n
Maurer, C. *50n*, 69n, 137n
MacGregor, G. H. C. *49n*
McKenzie, J. L. 60, *60n*
McNeile, A. H. *169n*
McPolin, J. *80n*
Meeks, W. *69n*, 88n, 91n, 98n, 100n
Michel, O. *130n*
Michl, J. *210n*
Mingana, A. 167n
Moffatt, J. 48, *48n*
Moltmann, J. 2, *2n*
Morawe, G. *173n*
Morris, L. *31n*
Moule, C. F. D. *13n*, 61, *61n*, 62n, 116n, 131n, 165n, *177n*
Mowinckel, S. *9n*, 14n, 21n, 90n
Müller, K. *42n*
Murmelstein, B. *39n*
Murphy-O'Connor, J. *42n*

Neufeld, V. H. *14n*
Noack, B. *50n*
Nock, A. D. 17, *18n*, 148n
Norden, E. 155n, *203n*

Odeberg, H. *27n*, 58n, 91n, 98, 98n, 101n, 103n, 107n, 118n
Oesterley, W. O. E. and Box, G. H. *39n*
Otto, R. 3n
Otzer, B. 43n

Pannenberg, W. 2, *2n*
Perler, O. *140n*, 162n, 168n
Perrin, N. *2n*, 4, 4n, *67n*, 92n, 93n, 94n, 123n
Philonenko, M. 167n, *168n*
Peterson, E. *97n*, 178n, 179n, 181n, 196n, *197n*
Piper, O. *178n*
Preiss, T. *81n*, 106n, *140n*, 144n, 158, 158n
Preuschen, E. 171n
Price, J. L. *55n*
Prigent, P. *178n*

Quasten, J. *166n*, 174n, 175n
Quispel, G. *24n*, 26, *97n*, 171n, *197n*

Rad, G. von *38n*, 71n
Rathke, H. 136n
Reicke, B. 26
Reitzenstein, R. *147n*, 171n
Rengstorf, K. H. *81n*
Ricca, P. *50n*, 61n, 65f, 84ff, 105n, 120n, 125n, 129n
Richter, G. *69n*
Richardson, C. C. *143n*, 156n, 162n, 179n
Riesenfeld, H. *168n*
Ringgren, H. *19n*, *35n*, 41n
Robertson, A. T. *142n*, 143n, 163n

Robinson, J. A. T. 1, 53, *53n*, 60, *60n*
Robinson, J. M. 110, *110n*, 115, *115n*, 116, 116n, 124n, *173n*
Rohde, J. *66n*
Rordorf, W. *178n*
Ross, J. F. *91n*
Ruckstuhl, E. *50n*
Rudolf, K. *25n*, *26n*, 171n, *172n*, 191n
Russell, D. S. *91n*

Sambursky, S. *208n*
Sanders, J. N. *137n*
Sanders, J. N. and Mastin, B. *31n*, 56, 56n, 58n, 104n, 105n, 118n, 129, 129n
Sasse H. *43n*
Schenke, H. M. 171, *171n*, 172n
Schlier, H. *26n*, 145n, 146n, 171n, 183n
Schmidt, K. L. *5n*, *143n*
Schnackenburg, R. *77n*, *99n*
Schneemelcher, W. *136n*
Schniewind, J. 18n
Schoeps, H. J. 26, *172n*, 210n, *217n*
Schüle, E. U. *199n*
Schulthess, T. 167n, 168n
Schulz, S. *67n*, 94, 125n, *167n* 171n
Schweitzer, A. 1, 1n, 3, 29, 30n, 114, *114n*, 156n
Schweizer, E. *14n*, 17n, *50n*, *66n*, 82n, 103n
Scott, E. F. *51*, *56n*, *57n*, 61n, 71n, 103f., 107n, 108, 108n, 110n, 112n, 113n, 121n
Segelberg, E. *171n*
Sholem, G. *41n*, 186n
Sidebottom, E. M. *108n*
Sjöberg, E. *34n*, *89n*
Smith, D. M. *49n*, 50n, 52n
Smith, W. R. *9n*
Sohm, R. 71n
Sowers, S. G. *19n*
Sprengling, M. 171n
Stauffer, E. 60, *60n*
Stendahl, K. *63n*
Stölten, W. 171n
Strack, H. L. and Billerbeck, P. *34n*, 39n, 43n, 189n
Strugnell, J. *32n*
Stuhlmacher, P. *31n*
Tarn, W. W. *170n*
Taylor, V. *203n*
Testuz, M. 25n, 167n, *168n*, 173
Thompson, L. L. *14n*, 32n, 178n, 179n
Tödt, H. E. *92n*
Tondelli, L. 167n, *174n*, 175n, 183n
Trilhaas, W. *10n*
Troeltsch, E. *5n*
Turner, N. *120n*

Unnik, W. C. van 53, *53n*, *92*, *171n*

Verweijs, P. G. *198n*, 199n, 200f.
Vielhauer, P. 176n, *189n*, 190n, 192n
Volz, P. *1n*, 29n, 39n, 42n, 43n, 185n, 189n
Vööbus, A. *22n*, 167n, 196n, *197n*, 215n, 218n

Wach, J. *9n*, 10n
Weiser, A. *89n*
Weiss, J. 1, *137n*
Wellhausen, J. 167n, 171n
Wendt, H. H. *49n*
Werbeck, W. *27n*
Werner, M. *16n*, *17n*, 23n, 30n, 153n, 209n, 212n, 216n
Westcott, B. F. *63n*, 118n, 129n
Whitehouse, W. A. *1n*, 6n
Whiteley, D. E. H. *122n*
Wilson, R. McL. 26, *26n*, 198n
Wustmann, G. *146n*, 158n

Yadin, Y. 19n

Zanetti, P. S. *147n*

INDEX OF REFERENCES

I. JEWISH LITERATURE

1. *Old Testament*

Genesis
1:29 217n
6:1ff. 42n
28 96

Exodus
24-31 19n

Psalms
110:1 94, 133

Isaiah
6:1-13 90
11:6ff. 38n
27:11 43
65:17-25 38n

Jeremiah
1:4f. 95

Daniel
7:13 94, 97, 133
12:2f. 40n

Hosea
4:16 43

Joel
2:28ff. 91
3:1ff. 34n

Zechariah
12:10f. 133

2. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*

Apocalupsis Mosis
9:3 189n
37:4 189n
40:2 186n
41:1 189n

II Baruch
51:5 40n
51:10 40n
51:11 40n
56:6 216n
59:8 186n
73:1 189n

III Baruch
4-9 186n

II Enoch
8:1ff. 189n
9:1 189n
65:8ff. 192

IV Ezra
7:80 189n
7:91 189n
7:95 189n
7:123 189n
8:51f. 189

IV Maccabees
7:19 162n
10:15 162n
13:17 162n
16:25 162n
17:4 162n
17:18 162n
18:23 162n

Vita Adae et Evae
36:1f. 189n

3. *Qumran Literature*

IQS (Manual of Discipline)
1:18 43
1:24 43
2:4f. 43
2:19 43
3:18 44
3:20f. 43
3:24 44
4:6ff. 38
4:8 187n

4:20ff. 35
4:23 38, 43
6:3ff. 41
10:21 43
11:7f. 32n
11:8 40on

IQSa (Rule of the Congregation)
1:29-2:1 42n

IQSb (Book of Blessings)
2:8f. 41
4:2f. 187n
4:25 40on
4:28 187n

CD (Damascus Document)
1:13 43
2:16ff. 42n
3:19ff. 38, 192
4:12f. 43
5:16f. 43
5:17ff. 43
6:14f. 43
15:10 43
16:2f. 43

IQH (Hymns)
3:19 33
3:19-36 31
3:20 33
3:21 32, 33
3:21ff. 32, 32n, 41, 177
3:22 32n
3:23 33
6:14-17 37
7:23ff. 38
8:16-20 37
9:25 187n
11:3-14 31
11:10 33
11:12 32
11:13 32
11:13f. 32, 41
11:14 33
11:15ff. 31, 33
11:33 33
15 31, 33
15:15f. 33
15:17 33
17:15 38

IQM (War Scroll)
14:9 43

4QH171
2:10 38
3:1f. 38

4. *Rabbinic Literature*

bBerachoth
17a 217n

bHaggigah
14b 41n, 99n

bSanhedrin
59a 217n
59b 217n

Sanhedrin
10.1 116n

Genesis Rabbah
34.13 217n

Leviticus Rabbah
13.2 217n

5. *Philo*

Quaest. in Ex.
2.46 100n

II. EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

1. *New Testament*

Matthew
3:15 145
10:24f. 79
10:40f. 79n
11:25-30 63n
11:28ff. 190, 190n
16:18 187n
16:19 82
18:18 82
18:19f. 176n

22:29f. 202, 204
24:30 97
24:37ff. 205
26:64 93n, 97
27:52f. 153n
28:19 82

Mark
5:41f. 120n
8:38 124
9:1 92
9:26f. 120n
12:24f. 202, 203n, 204
13:6 176n
13:22 176n
13:26 92f.
14:62 92ff., 97
16:16 82

Luke
6:40 79
16:8 204
17:27 205
20:34 204
20:34ff. 22, 202ff. 209, 214 219
20:35 203
20:36 203n, 204, 208, 208n
22:69 93n
23:43 209n
24:42 212n
24:47 82

John
1:1-18 64n
1:4 106n
1:5 122
1:9 126n
1:11 126n
1:13 100
1:17f. 77n
1:18 99
1:32ff. 81
1:33 103n
1:45-51 66n
1:50 96n
1:51 93n, 96ff., 111, 133, 178n
2:1ff. 67n
2:11 90
2:18 127
2:20 70n
2:22 71, 118n
2:28 127
3:2 126n, 127
3:3 80, 100, 103
3:5 103n, 106n
3:5f. 103, 106n
3:6 103
3:7 80, 100, 103
3:11f. 99
3:13 91, 91n, 99, 126n
3:13ff. 126
3:14f. 98n
3:14-21 125
3:15 106, 125
3:18 122
3:19 122, 126n
3:31 126n
3:34 70, 81, 104
3:35 82
3:36 106, 106n, 110ff., 133n
4:1-3 70n
4:1-42 66n
4:2 127
4:10f. 184n
4:14 106
4:23 104
4:23f. 104
4:31ff. 117n
4:36 106
4:46 67n
5:1ff. 67n
5:6 127
5:7ff. 70n
5:14 83
5:19 70
5:19-24 119, 119n
5:19-29 94
5:19-30 119
5:20 127
5:21 107, 118f.
5:22f. 125
5:22-27 125
5:24 103, 106, 106n, 111, 118f.
5:25 114-120
5:25-30 119, 119n
5:26 82, 107, 107n
5:27 82, 125
5:28 119
5:28f. 115, 119, 49n, 50, 51n
5:29 106
5:30ff. 70

5:40 106
6:14 126n
6:26-71 98n
6:27 106f., 125
6:33 126n
6:38 126n
6:39 51, 49n, 62
6:40 49n, 51, 62, 106, 106n, 111ff.
6:44 49n, 51, 62
6:47 106
6:50 126n
6:51 106n, 113n, 126n
6:51b-58 50, 59n, 68, 112n
6:53 106, 112, 113n
6:54 49n, 51, 62, 112
6:56 113n
6:57 107n
6:58 126n
6:68 106
7:16ff. 70
7:28 126n
7:37ff. 184n
7:39 90, 114, 146n, 170n, 184n
8:14ff. 70
8:14 126n
8:23 80
8:32 71
8:35 130
8:38 70
8:40 70
8:42 126n
8:46 71
8:51 114
8:56 91
9:1ff. 67n
9:4a 81n
9:4bf. 81n
9:35-41 125
9:39 126n
10:10 106
10:17 82
11:1ff. 67n
11:4 90
11:21-27 58
11:25 82, 106f., 120n, 160
11:25f. 114, 116, 120f., 117
11:26 115, 120
11:30 90
11:40 133n
12:1 118n
12:9 118n
12:17 118n
12:20-36 125
12:25 106
12:26 129, 131
12:28 90
12:32f. 69
12:34 125
12:39ff. 90
12:41 98n
12:47 126n
12:47ff. 70
12:48 49n, 51, 111n, 122, 124
13-17 126
13:3 126n
13:7 71
13:15f. 78
13:16a 79n
13:16 79, 79n
13:16b 79, 79n, 82
13:20 79, 82, 105
13:34f. 82
14 128f.
14-16 59n
14:2 130f.
14:3 127-131
14:6 82, 107, 126, 160
14:12 81, 105, 119
14:18ff. 131
14:18 127f.
14:19 59n, 82, 128, 106n
14:20 132
14:22 59n, 132n
14:23 127f., 130f.
14:25f. 70f.
14:28 127f.
14:30 126
15:1-13 106n
15:13 80
15:14f. 79
15:18 80
15:19 80
15:20 78ff.
15:22 126
15:26 126
16:1f. 80
16:2 80, 126
16:4 126
16:7f. 126
16:8 83
16:10 128, 132f.
16:12ff. 70f., 80
16:13 126

16:16 128, 132f.
16:17 128, 132
16:19 128, 132
16:20 79n
16:22 128, 132
16:25 126, 128
16:26 104
16:27f. 126
16:30 126
16:32 126
16:33 80
17:1 126
17:3 77n, 106n
17:8 80
17:11 126
17:12 69
17:13 126
17:14 80, 103
17:18 82, 105
17:21 78
17:23f. 78
17:23 82
17:24 90, 129, 131
18:9 69, 69n, 71
18:32 69, 69n
18:37 126n
20:9 118n
20:21b 82, 105
20:22 162n
20:23 82
20:31 77n, 106n
21:14 118n
21:22f. 129, 131

Acts
2:16ff. 91
2:46 130n
5:42 130n
6:3 92
6:5 91
6:10 92
6:10f. 91
6:15 93
7:55 92
7:55f. 91, 93n, 94
7:56 92, 97
9:1-9 95
9:36-43 120n
11:27 182n
11:28 178n
13:1ff. 182n
13:2 177n
15:30 178
15:32 182n
20:7ff. 120n
20:20 130n
21:10 182n
22:3-11 95
26:9-18 95

Romans
1:18 122n
2:12 123
6:4 157
9:5 64n
15:18f. 81
16:5 130n

I Corinthians
1:2 143n
3:17 123
4:4 152n
6:10 164n
9:1 95
9:25 187n
11:10 178n
12:3 13
12:9f. 81
12:28 81
13:1 178n
14:1-5 177n, 178
14:23ff. 100, 177n, 178
14:26 178n
14:38 123
14:39 177n, 178
15 207n
15:8ff. 95
15:42ff. 163
15:49 214
15:50 163
16:19 130n
16:22 17

II Corinthians
1:1 143n
4:10 214
5:1 130n
9:6 123
12:1ff. 95
12:2f. 186n, 209n
12:3 186n
12:3f. 41n
12:11ff. 81

Galatians
1:9 123
1:12 95
1:15 95

1:16 95
2:20 158n
3:3 81
3:5 81
3:26 208n
4:6 208n

Ephesians
5:18f. 177
6:10-17 147

Philippians
2:5ff. 13, 64n
2:10 13n

Colossians
1:15-20 64n
3:1ff. 21
3:5ff. 21
3:12ff. 21
3:16 177
4:15 130n

I Thessalonians
3:13 97
4:13ff. 121

II Thessalonians
1:7 97

I Timothy
3:15 130
3:16 64n
4:1ff 117

II Timothy
2:11 150n
2:11ff. 150n
2:18 18n, 115ff.
3:12 150n
4:8 187n

Philemon
2 130n

Hebrew
1:8 64n
2:5ff. 97
2:8b-9a 96n
2:10f. 150n
2:18 150n
3:2-6 130
3:19 190
4:3 190f.
4:10 190
5:9 150n
7:28 150n
11:35 120n
12:1 159n

James
1:12 187n

I Peter
2:5 130
4:17 130
5:4f. 187n

II Peter
1:1 64n

I John
1:1f. 107
2:16 107
2:8 122n
2:10f. 82
2:25 106
2:27 70n
2:28 129, 131
3:2 129, 131, 133n
3:11 82
3:13 106
3:14 106n, 118
3:14-24 82
3:15 106
4:7ff. 82
4:9 82
4:13 70n
4:16ff. 82
4:16 21
5:11f. 82
5:12 106, 107
5:13 106
5:16 106
5:20 70n, 107

II John
7 127
10 130

Revelation
1:7 92, 95, 97, 132n
1:10 95, 178

1:12ff.	95
2:5	95, 127
2:16	95, 127
2:10	187n
3:5	188n
3:11	127, 187n
4:1	95
4:2ff	95
4:4	187n
4:10	187n
5:9	188n
6:2	187n
6:9ff.	162n
12	187n
12:1	187n
13:1ff.	188n
14:3	188n
14:14	187n
16:15	127
22:1	184n
22:7	127
22:12	127
22:17	184n
22:18f.	123
22:20	17, 127
20:4	162n
21:6	184n

2. *Apostolic Fathers*

Barnabas	
4:13	182n
15f.	182n
I Clement	
63:1	159n
II Clement	
7:1ff.	187n
14:1	19n
20:2	187n
Didache	
4:1	180
4:1f.	131, 176n, 180ff.
9:4	17
10:5	17
10:6	17
11:1f.	131, 176n, 180
13:1ff.	180
15:1f.	180
Hermas	
Visions	
2. 4	19n
Mandates	
11. 1	180
11. 5	180
11. 9	180, 191
11. 13	180
12. 2. 5	187n
Similitudes	
8. 2. 1ff.	187n
8. 3. 6	187n
8. 4. 6	187n
Ignatius	
Ephesians	
Inscr.	143n
1:1	149, 164
1:1f.	151
1:2	150, 162n
1:3	149
2:1	124n, 151
3:1	150
3:1f.	145
3:2	160
4:2	144f.
5:1	144, 144n
5:2	148
5:2f.	151
5:3	144f.
6:1	144, 144n, 176n, 190n
7:2	139n, 140n, 160
8:2	151
10:1ff.	151
10:2	151
10:3	149
11:1	137n, 159n
11:2	150, 152
12:1	152n
12:2	136, 162
13:1	148
13:1f.	142
13:2	142n
14:1	149, 149n
14:2	151, 162
15:1f.	190n
16:1	139n, 163
16:2	163
17:1	159n, 162, 162n
18:1	160, 164

18:1f. 139n
18:2 139n, 142, 145
18:2-19:1 141
19 138n
19:1 139n, 191n
19:1f. 139n
19:1ff. 140
19:2f. 141ff.
19:3 142n
20:1 139n, 140, 142, 152n
20:2 59n, 139n, 147, 160f.
20:2f. 154
21:1 124n

Magnesians
Inscr. 143n, 164
1:2 140, 142n, 160
3:1 144
4:1 144
5:1f. 159
5:2 139, 139n, 143, 157ff., 164
6:1 137n, 144
6:2 151, 161
7:1 137n
7:2 144
8:1 152n, 160
8:2 137n, 150, 191n
9:1 139n, 149n, 160
9:2 153n, 160
10:1 155
11:1 139, 139n, 152n
12:1 151
13:1 151
14 148n
14:1 145, 162
15:2 160

Trallians
Inscr. 139n, 140, 143n, 152, 156, 156n
1:1f. 151
1:2 149
2:1 139n, 160
3:1 144
3:2 151
4:1f. 151
4:2 141f.
6:2 148n
7:1f. 151
8:1 148, 151, 158n
8:2 145, 151
9:1 139n
9:2 152, 153n, 160
10 155
10:1 76n, 139, 139n, 140, 143, 149, 155
11:2 139n, 160
12:1 151
12:3 152, 162n
13:3 152, 162

Romans
Inscr. 143n
1:1 151
1:1f. 152, 162
1:2 162, 162n
2:1 162
2:2 150
3:3 150
4:1 157, 160, 162
4:2 153n
4:3 136, 152
5:1 152n
5:3 150, 162n
6:1 159n
6:2 157, 159n
6:3 139n
7:1 141, 150
7:2 137n, 139n, 146, 146n, 184n
7:3 139n, 148
8:1 124n
8:3 162
9:2 162

Philadelphians
Inscr. 139n, 143n, 152n
1:1 191n
3:2 144
3:3 139n, 147, 147n, 163, 164n
4:1 140, 147n, 148
5:1 148, 151, 162n
5:1f. 152, 164
5:2 139, 139n
6:1 155n
6:2 141
7:1 137n, 146n
7:2 149, 151
8f. 154
8:1 141
8:2 139, 139n, 142, 152n
9 138n
9:1 137n

9:2 139, 139n, 152n, 154, 161, 164
10:1f. 124n

Smyrnaeans
Inscr. 143n
1:1 139n, 145, 158n
1:2 139n, 152n, 160
2 155
2:1 139, 139n, 143, 155f., 164
3:1 139n, 152n
3:2 140, 142
3:3 139n, 144n, 152n
4:1 51n, 156, 160
4:2 76n, 140, 149, 150, 153n, 155
5:1 76n, 124n, 140, 149
5:2 155
5:3 139, 139n, 143, 153n, 156
6:1 142n, 151
7:1 51n, 59n, 145, 147, 152, 153n, 156, 164
7:1f. 139n
7:2 152n, 154
8:2 145, 146
9:1 124n
9:2 124n, 151
10:2 151
11:1 162
12:2 139n, 152n

Polycarp
1:2 142n, 164
2:3 159n, 161f.
3:2 139n
5:2 151
6:1 153n
6:2 142n, 145
7:1 142, 152, 152n, 162

Martyrdom of Polycarp
5:2 93n
17:1 187n
19:2 187n

Polycarp, *Philippians*
9:2 153n

3. *Other Early Christian Literature*

Acts of Peter
24 187n

Adamantius, *Dialogus*
2. 6 200n

Ascension of Isaiah
9:7-13 187n
9:24ff. 187n
9:27f. 187n
11:8-14 187n
11:40 187n

Clement of Alexandria

Excerpta ex Theodoto
21. 1f. 7n

Stromateis
2. 9. 45. 5 182n
5. 14. 96. 3 182n

Clementine Homilies
15. 7 43n
20. 2 43n

Chrysostom, *Hom. XII on Tim. 2*
2 211n

Cyprian, *Epistles*
72. 4 201n
73. 4 200n
73. 21 11n

Ephrem, *De paradiso*
6 218n

Epiphanius

Panarion
30. 16. 2 43n
41. 1. 1 218n
42. 3. 6 213n
42. 3. 8f. 213n
42. 5. 1 207
42. 8. 1f. 199n
48. 4. 1 177n
52. 1. 1 to 52. 3. 8 179n
78. 18. 7 217n

Scholion
71 209n

Epistula ad Rhegium
48:13-19 20n, 183n

Epistula Apostolorum
19 210n

Eusebius

Hist. eccl.
2. 23. 13 93n
3. 24. 7 63n
3. 26 18n, 204n, 219n

Praeparatio
1. 106 217n

Evangelium Veritatis
17:18-25 20n, 172

Filastrius *Diversarum hereseon liber*
44. 1f. 218n

Gospel of Thomas
13 207n

Hippolytus

Apostolic Tradition
20. 8 162n

Fragmenta 203n, 210n

Ref. omn. haer.

10. 19 207n

Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* (secundum Harvey)
1. 1. 12 6n
1. 1. 16 6n
1. 17 18n, 117n, 219n
2. 5. 1 19n
2. 7. 1 19n
2. 47. 1 7n
1. 25. 2 199n
3. 4. 3 218n
3. 13. 1 195n
3. 15. 2 7n
3. 22 210
3. 32. 1 217n
3. 35. 1 217n
5. 19. 1 217n

Justin

Apology I
26. 4 18n, 117n, 219n
63. 10 210
63. 16 210

Dialogus
57. 2 210
81. 4 203n, 205, 211n
100. 5 217n
131. 3 210

Ps.-Justin

De resurr. 211n
3 203n, 211n

Odes of Solomon
1:1 187
1:4 187
3:4ff. 192
3:7ff. 192
3:8 187
4:6ff. 187
4:6 172n
4:9f. 183
4:10 181
4:15 172
5:1 173n
5:3 172n
5:4ff. 189
5:10ff. 192
5:12 187
5:14f. 187, 189
6:1 177n
6:1f. 176
6:5f. 183
6:6 172n
6:7 170n, 184n
6:12ff. 183n
6:15ff. 187
6:18 184n, 187
7:4 187
7:4ff. 191
7:9 172
7:10 172n
7:16ff. 184n, 187
7:17 177n
7:22 172n
7:24 172, 172n

7:25 172n
8:22f. 192
9:5 172n
9:8ff. 187
9:11 188n
11 167n, 168, 168n
11:1 172n
11:3 192
11:10 179, 188n
11:11 187
11:11-17 191
11:12-16 182
11:14f. 179, 188n
11:16 185n
11:16f. 185
11:18 185n
11:21 168n
11:23 185n
11:24 185n
12:1f. 184n
12:4-11 172n
12:10 172
14:7ff. 181
14:8 177n
15:6ff. 193
15:8 172n, 187
15:10f. 192
16:5 176
16:5-19 172
16:15ff. 172n
17 175n
17:1 187
17:15 183
18:1 188n
18:3 187
18:7 183
19:7 187n
20 176, 180
20:1f. 172n
20:7 172n, 185, 185n
20:7f. 187
20:7ff. 187, 191
21 186
21:1 172n
21:4 187
21:5 187
22 188n
22:7 192
22:7f. 193
22:8 193
23:2 172n
24:10 192
25:4 172n
25:8 187
25:8f. 187
26:1 188n
26:3 177n, 190
26:10 177, 182, 190
26:12 191
26:12f. 182, 184n
27 192
28:3 191
28:4ff. 189
29:4 193
30:1f. 170n, 184n
30:1-5 183n
31:3 188n
31:7 187
32:3 190
33:1 172n
33:6-13 175n
33:10 172n
33:13 192
34:1-6 188
34:2 190
34:4 20n, 172
34:4f. 183n
34:6 193
35:1 190
35:4 190
35:5ff. 191
36:1 191
36:1f. 179, 182, 186, 188n
36:1-8 187
36:4 178n
36:7 183n
36:8 190
37:1ff. 181, 191
38:1 186
38:1ff. 191
38:4ff. 192
38:10f. 188n
39 192
41:2-7 183
41:3f. 193
41:11 183
41:16 188n
42:12-20 192
42:14 193
42:21ff. 183

Protevangelium of James
19 187n

Socrates
Hist. eccl.
6. 8 170n

Tertullian

Adv. Marc.
1. 2. 3 218n
1. 14. 2f. 209n
1. 14. 4 213n
1. 24. 3 199n
1. 24. 6 199n
1. 24. 7 208
1. 28. 2f 213
1. 29. 1 206n
2. 4. 4 198n, 207n
3. 5 195n
3. 8. 4 208
3. 8. 7 207
3. 9. 1 209n
3. 9. 3 210n
3. 9. 4 203n, 207n, 211n
3. 9. 5 210n
3. 11. 2 210n
3. 24. 6 210n
4. 6. 3 197n, 202n
4. 12 197
4. 17. 11 218n
4. 38. 5 205
4. 38. 8 206n
4. 39. 11 203n, 211n
5. 9. 1-6 207
5. 10. 4 203n
5. 10. 10f. 214n
5. 11 208n, 214
5. 12. 8 209n
5. 15. 7f. 207

Adv. Val.
30 7n
31 6n

De anima
1. 4 201n
8. 3ff. 208n
17. 5 208n
50. 1 18n, 117n, 219n
55. 4 162n
55. 5 162n

De bapt.
15 201n
18. 2 206n
18. 3 206n

De carne Christi
6 210n
14 210n

De cultu fem.
1. 2. 5 211n

De exhort.
1. 3f. 217n

De ieiunio
5. 1 217n
6. 7 196n
15. 1f. 213n

Ad martyr.
1. 3 162n
2. 9 162n

De monogamia
1. 1 211n
3. 1 211n
5. 3f. 217n
5. 5 217n
7. 4 196n
8. 7 196n

De praescr. haer.
23. 1ff. 195n
33 18n

De pud.
8. 9 177n
16. 19 196n

De resurr.
36. 5 203n, 211n
43. 4 162n

De resurr. carn.
42. 4 210n

De resurr. mort.
19. 5f. 209n

Ad uxorem
1. 3. 1 211n
1. 4. 4f. 212n
1. 7. 1 212n

De virg. vel.
5. 1 217n

Ps.-Tertullian

Adv. omn. haer.
1 18n, 117n, 219n
6. 1 207n
6. 2 207n, 218n
6. 6 207n

Carmen adv. Marc.
1. 141 218n
3. 286 218n

III. LATE GREEK LITERATURE

Diogenes Laertius

1. 140 208n

Lucian

De morte Peregrini
11 181n
40 187n

Plutarch

De esu carn.
1. 2 216n

Poimandres
15 216n